



Title	Problems on the Science of State Administration in the U.S.S.R
Author(s)	Sakano, Motomu
Citation	Osaka University Law Review. 1967, 15, p. 11-34
Version Type	VoR
URL	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/11094/9829">https://hdl.handle.net/11094/9829</a>
rights	
Note	

*The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

## PROBLEMS ON THE SCIENCE OF STATE ADMINISTRATION IN THE U. S. S. R.<sup>†</sup>

Motomu SAKANO\*

In the Soviet Union of today, the historical problem of the gradual transition from socialism to communism and also that of the gradual transformation of socialist statehood into 'communist social self-administration' (or the withering away of the state) has brought forth a practical problem in the form of "the all-round extension and perfection of socialist democracy."<sup>1)</sup> This, in turn, has demanded a re-examination of the already-known various concepts and methods as regards discussion of 'Soviet state apparatus', and has in consequence called for the establishment and development of the 'science of *administration*' (наука управления).<sup>2)</sup> The objective of this science is to make 'functional analysis' from a view-point of the interdependent relationship between the structure and function of the state apparatus, by grasping the apparatus as one with which to administer state and social affairs.

As is pointed out by Yuzuru Taniuchi, in the Soviet Union, "the concept of bureaucracy or bureaucratization is generally understood as being synonymous to 'bureaucratism', i.e., to only the dis-functional side of bureaucracy in the Weberian terminology", and therefore there is in this country no other concept but that of 'apparatus'. Besides, "most of what is discussed in terms of this

† This is a summary of my Japanese paper published under the title: "Soviet State Apparatus and Administration; new advocacy of the science of administration in the U.S.S.R." in "Handai Högaku" (Osaka University Law Review), No. 58, 1966.

\* Assistant Professor of Politics, Osaka University.

1) Программа КПСС (Programme of the C.P.S.U.), 1961, p. 101.

2) Russian word 'управление' seems to have a wider meaning than 'администрация'. The Russian 'управление' usually means 'administration' in the broadest sense, while 'управление' is occasionally used as 'administration' in the narrow sense, that is, 'the work of execution and the administrative disposal'. In this paper, Russian terms: 'управление', 'наука управления', 'государственное управление' and 'орган государственного управления' were respectively translated into English terms: 'administration', 'science of administration', 'state administration' and 'organ of state administration'.

concept refers to the system of legal institution within the political and administrative organization and to what this system should function.” This concept of ‘apparatus’ does “not imply the dis-functional side of bureaucracy as immanent within its own structure.” In other words, this concept is “not grasped as a structure of which the functional side is tied up to the dis-functional.”<sup>3)</sup> It follows from the above that, when issues are made of bureaucratization within the Soviet machinery, attention is paid not to the structure itself of the apparatus but to the personal behaviour of the constituent officials, i.e., ‘personnel problems’, or otherwise to some factors extraneous to the apparatus or to the regime, which may have caused bureaucratic distortions.

However, “a close examination of the origin of such a concept of apparatus seems to prove that it has not always been proper to the Russian Marxists.”<sup>4)</sup> Taking note of a “partial revival of bureaucratism within the Soviet machinery”, in the 8th Party Congress, in 1919, Lenin pointed out the difficulty of overcoming bureaucratism, especially because of the backward nature of the Russian society. He, then, went even so far as to admit that it was necessary to take a step backward from the principle of the ‘Paris Commune’, stressing, on the other hand, the need of constantly referring to the realities of the Soviet machinery, which was always threatened by bureaucratic distortions, and also the need of approaching in practical ways the fundamental theme: the “elimination of bureaucratism, to be achieved through the participation, by the whole population, in the ‘state administration’ (государственное управление).”<sup>5)</sup> Moreover, when in 1920 the problem of ‘collegiality’ and ‘one-man management’ was put to the debate in relation to economic administration, Lenin made the point clear by stating that “participation by the new class in the ‘administration’ (управление), either on the basis of collegiality or on that of one-man management”, that is to say, the “problem of how the new class should administer,” ought not to be confused with the totally different problem: “In what respects is ‘class rule’ making its appearance?”<sup>6)</sup> As for that former point at issue, it should be pointed out

3) Yuzuru Taniuchi: Bureaucracy in the Soviet Union, “Shisō (Thought)”, January 1965, p. 61, 67.

4) Ibid., p. 67.

5) Кпсс в резолюциях и решениях съездов и. т. д., Часть I (Resolutions and Decisions of C.P.S.U. Congress, etc., Part I), 1954, p. 416; and Ленин, Сочинения (Lenin, Works), 4th ed., Vol. 29, pp. 160-2, Vol. 27, pp. 220-1.

6) Ленин, Сочинения (Lenin, works), 4th ed., Vol. 30, pp. 400, 425-8, 443-4.

here, it is the "principle and structure of administration,"<sup>7)</sup> the actual application, in various practical forms, of the principle of the Paris Commune that is to be examined.<sup>8)</sup> In the 20's and in the earlier 30's, the Soviet Union paid much attention to the study of the 'science of administration', the particularity of which is the great emphasis placed upon the need of exploiting and assimilating critically scientific achievements reached in foreign countries with respect to 'labour management'. Ever since the latter half of the 30's, however, this study "fell by degrees into disuse and soon ceased to exist."<sup>9)</sup>

The transition of the science of administration, such as has been briefly described in the above, parallels the process of the study of bureaucratization in the Soviet Union as it gradually declined under the interior and exterior circumstances of those days, precipitated above all by the heated intraparty struggles, while in actual practice the entire structure of the Soviet political system underwent an increasing consolidation in bureaucratization. Under these circumstances what was of the utmost importance was, after all, to find ways and means of acquiring, while combating bureaucratism, as many proletariats as possible for the political organization of the Soviet and of excluding, at the same time, foreign (anti-proletarian) elements from it, instead of paying regard to issues springing from the organization itself, which practice had in earlier times been considered the primary requisite in discussing the problem.<sup>10)</sup> This further gave rise to a tendency, on the part of the Marxist theorists, to commit everything to the matter of 'production relations' by applying an ideological way of thinking to the problem of bureaucracy, and to pay no attention to the actual state of bureaucracy. This way of disposing of problem led, in the long run, to the exclusion of the subject itself from the field of discussion, for the alleged reason that the proposition of such problem was itself inspired by some antagonistic ideology.<sup>11)</sup>

7) Yuzuru Taniuchi: Bureaucracy in the Soviet Union, "Shisō (Thought)", January 1965, p. 67.

8) Ibid., pp. 67-8.

9) Ц. А. Ямпольская, Вступительная статья к книге Е. Старосыцяка «Элементы Науки Управления» (Ts. A. Yampolskaya, Introductory of "Elements of the Science of Administration" by Starocichyak), 1965, pp. 9-13.

10) See Yuzuru Taniuchi: Bureaucracy in the Soviet Union, "Shisō (Thought)", January 1965, p. 68.

11) See Seisuke Tanaka: Bureaucracy and Social System, "Shisō (Thought)", August 1957, p. 60.

The extinction of the science of administration and the recedence of the study of bureaucracy in the Soviet Union led to the study of the "principle and structure of the appatus itself"<sup>12)</sup> being handed over to 'that of Soviet state apparatus', the subject to be disposed of within the framework of the 'science of administrative law'. It turned out, however, that the limited framework of this science was not conducive to developing the study of Soviet state apparatus. The extent to which the study could go in this manner was proved in the way in which the science of administrative law established the above-mentioned concept of 'apparatus'. It was apparently impossible to expect such a concept to be instrumental in making "structural analysis of the actual, i.e., both formal and informal, appearances of the function and dis-function of bureaucracy."<sup>13)</sup>

And now, after all this process, the Soviet Union of today, with the actual and practical needs of her society, demands establishment of such a 'science of administration' as will enable her to make the 'structural and functional analysis' of the state apparatus. This paper proposes in the following to inquire into a number of points at issue lately brought forth in the Soviet Union with regard to 'state administration' and the methodology of the 'science of administration'.

## I. The Concept of 'State Administration'

(государственное управление)

The Constitutions of the U.S.S.R., the Union Republics and the Autonomous Republics stipulate that 'the organs of execution and the administrative disposal' (исполнительные и распорядительные органы) shall be in charge of the 'state administration' (государственное управление),<sup>14)</sup> and in parallel with this statement has been the dominant interpretation that identifies 'state administration' with 'the work of execution and the administrative disposal' (исполнительная и распорядительная деятельность), by presuming that 'the organs of state administration' (органы государственных управлений) are exactly those whose function is to execute (исполнить) and dispose (распорядить).

12) Yuzuru Taniuchi: Bureaucracy in the Soviet Union, "Shisō (Thought)", January 1965, p. 68.

13) Ibid., p. 61.

14) See The Constitution of the U.S.S.R., Article 64 and others.

It seems, however, that such is not what Marx and Lenin mean to say by the terminology 'state administration' (государственное управление). Yu. A. Tikhomirov cites Marx as remarking that 'state administration' is the organizing activity of the state and that the two most important aspects of it is that it is possessed of power and works as an organization. According to his "State and Revolution", Lenin distinguishes 'state administration' from 'social administration' (общественное управление); in his later writings he often avails himself of the terminology 'state administration' in both its broad and narrow senses.<sup>15)</sup>

Moreover, it will be worthy of note that up to the time of the adoption of the current Constitution (1936), 'state administration' meant, as it seems now, not only a particular kind of 'activity of execution and the administrative disposal', but also the 'organizing activity of all organs of the state'. Ts. A. Yampolskaya reports M. I. Kalinin as observing at the 17th Party Congress in 1934 that 'to administer' is 'to organize', and by this illustration we are given to understand that 'administration' (управление) as such means not a particular form of activity by a certain group of organs but activity by the state as a whole. Before 1936, 'the organs of execution and the administrative disposal' (исполнительные и распорядительные органы) were not yet considered 'the organs of administration' (органы управлений), and the concept underlying the Constitution of 1918 and also that of 1924 was that the Soviet was 'the organ of state administration' (орган государственного управления) as well as 'one of state power' (орган государственной власти). In other words, the understanding prevailed in those days that 'state administration' was 'the work of the executive and disposing apparatus plus the Soviet as its higher organ', that is, 'the work of state apparatus as a whole', rather than of that lower apparatus alone.<sup>16)</sup>

The new Programme of the C.P.S.U., adopted on the 22nd Party Congress in 1961, contains an article entitled "the development of democratic principles

15) См. Ю. А. Тихомиров, Эволюция исполнительно-распорядительной деятельности в современный период, «Вопросы Советского Административного Права на Современном Этапе» (Yu. A. Tikhomirov: Evolution of the Executive and Administrative Activity in the Contemporary Period, "Problems of Soviet Administrative Law in the Present Stage"), p. 31.

16) См. Ц. А. Ямпольская, Актуальные проблемы науки советского административного права, «Советское Государство и Право», (Ts. A. Yampolskaya: Actual Problems of the Science of Soviet Administrative Law, "Soviet State and Law"), 1962, No. 10. pp. 21-2.

in the Soviet and in state administration.” What is referred to in this article is not merely administrative (executive) apparatus in the narrow sense of the term, but democratic principles in general to be applied to the apparatus of the Soviet and furthermore of the whole state.<sup>17)</sup> During the period of transition to communism, says Yu. M. Kozlov, the “administration of social affairs is not monopolized by the executive organ”; instead, direct participation by Soviet representative organs and social organizations in the administrative process (процесс управления) is at once quantitatively and qualitatively increased and strengthened. During the same period, the administration of social affairs still takes the form of ‘state administration’, but it also undergoes a basic change in quality: the change is directed to an increased democratization of state administration accompanied by an enlarged sociality of Soviet power.<sup>18)</sup> When a debate is given upon ways and means of elevating the roles to be played in the administrative process by the Soviet and social organizations, it is ‘state administration’ in the broad sense of the terminology that is being made a point at issue. In other words, the question is, in what form and by what method Soviet state is to set about the task of ‘organization’ — which means ‘administration’ in the broadest sense of the word — so that Soviet state can well meet the demand of the society in a particular stage of history. In actual practice, however, the Soviet representative organs exercise their administrative function through the instrumentality of executive apparatus, which is shaped by and holds responsible for and, therefore, subject to, those organs. Without this executive apparatus, the Soviet would be incapable of administrative activity in any form. Even during the period of transition to communism, the ‘functional differentiation’ between representative organs and executive ones will be maintained.<sup>19)</sup> “As socialist democracy furthers its development, the organs of state power will gradually be transformed into the organs of social self-administration.”<sup>20)</sup> It is to be expected that in the course of this transformation the executive apparatus

17) Ibid., p. 22.

18) См. Ю. М. Козлов, Некоторые вопросы дальнейшей демократизация советского государственного управления в современный период, «Вопросы Советского Административного Права на Современном Этапе» (Yu. M. Kozlov: Some Problems of the Further Democratization of the Soviet State Administration in the Contemporary Period, “Problems of Soviet Administrative Law in the Present Stage”), pp. 21-2.

19) Ibid., 22.

20) Программа КПСС (Programme of the C.P.S.U.), 1961, p. 101.

will contract and be reduced in size, but it is unlikely that circumstantial development will ever exclude the very existence of the apparatus. Herein can be found part of the ground for the necessity of establishing the science of administration as a scientific discipline which would deal with "the principles and laws of the functionalization of state administration."<sup>21)</sup>

With an increased elucidation, such as is in the foregoing, of the broad and narrow senses of the terminology of state administration, the study of this science in the Soviet Union is now about to take two courses. The first is, as it were, historical researches in which attempts are made to understand state administration as an appearance of historical developments in terms of social administration, and thereby to acquire a grasp of state administration in the historical context of the development of human society, which runs in the following order: the emergence of the state, the formation of class society, of capitalism, of socialist society, of communist society, and the withering away of the state. Here, researches are made with special emphasis upon the relationship that there is between the historical character of each of these social system and its administrative system, i.e., upon "how the historical character of a given social system determines its administrative apparatus." Since in the Soviet Union of today such researches are conducted with the withering away of the state in future prospect, they seem to be considered significant as constituting part of the problem of the withering away of the state. The second course is the study of the 'science of administration' (наука управления). It is, first of all, an attempt to meet the practical need of the highly developed Soviet society of today to rationalize its complicated administrative process and apparatus. It is also an attempt to make some methodological improvements upon the current Soviet theory of state apparatus and to revive and develop the 'science of administration' in the days of Lenin. Moreover, it may be said, though no Soviet researcher has yet clearly pronounced to this effect, that in the Soviet Union the study of 'state administration' now takes the place of the study of 'Soviet bureaucracy', which is grasped as a dynamic system with its function and disfunction tied up to each other within its own structure.

In the following the reader will be acquainted, first, with an article by

21) Е. Старосыцяк, «Элементы Науки Управления» (E. Starocichyak, "Elements of the Science of Administration"), 1965, p. 24.

Yu. E. Volkov, who is supposed to pursue researches along the first line of the subject, and next with one by G. S. Yakovlev and another by Yampolskaya, each dealing with the second aspect of the subject, i.e., the methodology of the science of administration.

## II. Relationship between Administrative Organization and Social System

Yu. E. Volkov brings up his problem as follows: One of the most important parts of the process of building communism is the gradual transformation from 'the socialist state' into 'communist social self-administration'. It is, as Lenin says, the change into the society in which every one shall administer. In the Soviet society of today, however, there is the special apparatus of administration, i.e., state apparatus, which is not only unlikely to die out in the foreseeable future but is having the forces of its personnel increased as a whole instead of decreased. Now, one may ask, what does this phenomenon have to do with the above-mentioned gradual transformation into communism? Or, does it mean to say that even under the socialist system there come into being a 'new ruling class to administer' and also social inequality between 'the administering' and 'the administered', such as is to be found in the West European society?<sup>22)</sup>

According to Volkov, in every form of human society, not excepting communist society, there is, as a rule, 'social power' and, therefore, also 'administrative apparatus.' That there is administrative apparatus is in itself no sign of there existing also the state. The existence of the special apparatus of administration (state apparatus), with all its aggrandizement and reduction, represents, in a sense, the outer surface of the realities, and it is the inner essence underlying them that really matters. Therefore, in dealing with the relationship between 'the administering' and 'the administered', due consideration should be given to the characteristics of the social relations and the social system, which, underlying that relationship, determines its inner character. From a point of view of sociological category, the "administration of society" is "to adopt deci-

22) См. Ю. Е. Волков, Организация управления обществом и характер социальных отношений, «Вопросы Философии» (Yu. E. Volkov: Organization of the Social Administration and the Character of Social Relations, "Problems of Philosophy"), 1965, No. 8, p. 13.

sions aimed at regulating diverse aspects of social life and the carrying out of practical measures to put these decisions into effect." Looked at in the light of the "administration of society", the state and statehood can be considered a certain historical form of administrative system. What form the administration of society takes, what groups of people administer, what is the relationship between this administrative personnel and other constituent members of society — these are all fundamentally dependent upon the character of social system, above all, upon the relations prevailing in society, which are, ultimately, those of production.<sup>23)</sup>

In the early stages of the development of human society, all members of the community participated in the activity of production and also in the administration of social affairs. With the emergence of classes, however, the character of social administration went through fundamental changes: administrative work ceased to be directly related to production and labour activity. Administration is carried out not by all constituent members of society, but by a special apparatus — that of state administration and of economic management. The class who possesses productive means and keeps a ruling economic position, administers and commands in the society. The administration is carried out by the ruling class with the aid of the apparatus which served it. Thus, in the class society the social administration takes the form of the class domination and assumes the political character. In the highly developed capitalist society, however, there exist, in its administrative apparatus of a wide variety, not merely repressive and compulsory apparatus but other calculating and recording apparatus of diverse kinds which basically has direct bearing upon production and is devoid of the repressive character. What is worthy of further note in relation to the modern capitalist society is the distinction there is between the concept of 'being engaged in the administrative system' and that of 'administering'. It should be born in mind that 'to administer' is to adopt decisions aimed at regulating the 'vital force' of the society and to put these decisions into effect. It is only those out of the administrative and management personnel who belong to the topmost group that are entitled to partake of making decisions aimed at regulating social life, while the overwhelming majority of the rest do nothing but carry out these decisions to be made by those few. In the capitalist society, it

---

23) Ibid., pp. 13-4.

is the capitalist class that is in possession of this administrative function. It must also be pointed out in this connexion that the so-called 'manager' ideology in the capitalist country of today covers up the essential reality of things existing in such a society, by making obscure the relations between the true possessor of administrative function and the administrative and management personnel.<sup>24)</sup>

Under the socialist society, the social administration still retains the form of 'state administration'. In the Soviet society of today, while the antagonistic contradictions and conflicts between 'the administering' and 'the administered' — those are proper to the exploiting society — have been liquidated, it must be admitted that non-antagonistic contradictions still remain between these two parts of the population. A certain rank composed of those who are engaged exclusively in the pursuit of administrative function in the socialist society, working just like all other members of society and in no way constituting a special class monopolizing means of production, yet forms a special social category apart, in that it is the executor of state power. There still exist essential social distinctions between this rank and all the other sections of society. Under communist society, the work of administration will lose its political character. So long as the work of administration belongs, as a general rule, to every member of society, these essential social distinctions now existing between the administrative personnel and all the rest of society will disappear. Yet Volkov is of the opinion that even under the communist system there still exist among the workers, in connexion with the parts played in pursuing administrative function, certain 'non-essential' distinctions according as the workers differ from one another in disposition, competence and knowledge. In the communist society, the work of social administration will remain the chief function of a definite portion of the people, though the character of the function and the ways in which it is carried out will be different from those under socialism. The character of administration will undergo a fundamental change, that is to say, the 'management of personnel' will be supplanted by 'the simple control of production and distribution'.<sup>25)</sup>

The process of gradual transition to 'communist social self-administration' is a long historical one, and the Soviet Union of today represents only one of its early stages. A further progress in socialist democracy demands that much

24) Ibid., pp. 14-6.

25) Ibid., pp. 16-7.

more policies and measures should be employed. There will be more betterment and reduction in the apparatus of state administration. On the other hand there will be a rapid increase in the number of new enterprises and establishments for cultural and social service. Under these circumstances that proportion of workers who engage in the work of state administration — civil servants — to other working people may lessen, but there is a possibility that their absolute number will increase. However, the actual state of progress in the Soviet society makes the presumption impossible that the society goes towards perpetuating the social split between 'the administering' and 'the administered.'<sup>26)</sup>

Volkov illustrates this by making a sociological analysis of statistical data concerning the administrative apparatus of the Sverdlovsk Region. It turns out that the administrative and management personnel of this Region constitutes approximately 8% of the total number of the workers and white-colour workers of the region. (Incidentally, in the course of a year and a half, March 1962 — September 1963, there was an increase by 10%.) It happens, however, that a little under 6% of all the personnel are state-administrative personnel (including that of judicial organs). The rest of the personnel are engaged in productive activities and in serving various establishments for cultural and social purposes. In prospect of its complete disappearance in the future, the state-administrative apparatus is at present being reduced in size. For instance, the function of maintaining social order is in charge of social organizations and is being completely fulfilled by 'non-state' organizations. But this is not the case with other part of administrative apparatus, such as producing facilities and establishments for cultural and social service. Apparatus of this latter variety will remain equally indispensable in the future as well and will never go out of existence of itself. Volkov, bringing under ten categories those administrative and management personnel engaged in producing facilities and in serving establishments for cultural and social life, and examining numerical changes which took place between March 1962 and September 1963, comes out with the following results.<sup>27)</sup>

26) *Ibid.*, pp. 17-8.

27) Volkov tabulates his data as follows. The overwhelming majority of the personnel produced in the following table is composed of personnel other than retainers of state-administrative function. The 10th group is made up of, as it were, employees, while the 4th, the 5th, the 6th, the 7th, the 8th and the 9th groups belong to supplementary administrative personnel. Of these, personnel in the 6th and the 7th groups are, unlike the others, in possession of some state-administrative function (or competence). However, they form but a small proportion of all per-

Group number	Category of administrative & management personnel	Distribution ratio (%)	Numerical changes Mar. 1962-Sep. 1963 (%)
1	Director & vice-director of enterprise, establishment & department thereof	22.6	105.2
2	Chief specialist & chief engineer	6.8	105.5
3	Specialist, engineer, etc.	14.7	110.3
4	Bookkeeper, account, statistician, etc.	19.6	102.0
5	Operator of computer bureau	1.3	115.4
6	Inspector, instructor, etc.	3.2	106.3
7	Time-keeper, accounting clerk, field-supervisor, etc.	5.0	103.5
8	Secretariat, clerk, typist, etc.	5.3	108.0
9	Telegraphist, communication operator, etc.	3.9	110.8
10	Store keeper, carrier, etc.	17.6	109.8

sonnel. They constitute that part which will go out of being with gradual transition into communism. On the contrary, the 4th, the 5th, the 8th and the 9th groups form that part which will stay; the 5th and the 9th, in particular, will rapidly increase their proportions. Distinction there is between those belonging to these groups and those engaged directly in production, but its quality is non-essential. Those in the 2nd and the 3rd groups are to be distinguished from working specialists since those former are engaged in executing the operative part of administrative work, but there again the differences is non-essential. According it is those who belong to the 1st group that concern the problem of overcoming essential distinctions among people themselves. These last do number over 1/5 of all the administrative and management personnel, but they amount to under 2% of all the working people. However, because of their function as retainers of state power (or persons in authority) they are essentially different from the rest of the personnel. Some of them will die out rapidly in the future, and others will be either reduced to a remarkable extent, or developed in such a way that their social basis will be expanded. (Ibid., pp. 21-2.)

The process of administration in different spheres of production and of cultural-social service is elementally divided into three: (a) maintenance of order and discipline in certain social groups, (b) adoption of fundamental decisions as regards the 'vital force' of these groups, and (c) operative technical guidance and control of labour process in the way of enforcing these decisions adopted. In spite of every social body and workers' group strengthening more and more their direct participation in their joint efforts to effectuate plans in these three ways, an equal amount of participation by every category of workers in relation to these efforts is not yet to be realized. At the present stage of development there exists a certain stratum of personnel which differs from the rest in that the former is provided with state power (or authority). With the general strengthening of direct participation, by social bodies and industrial workers, in the process of administration and also with a further development of socialist democracy, in other words, with gradual transition into communism, (a) and (b) of the three divisions mentioned above, will be in the hands of all bodies, of all their constituent members. As for (c), it will remain what specialist personnel of administration are to carry out, but their distinction from the rest will be only 'non-essential'.<sup>28)</sup>

### III. Problems of Method in the Science of Administration

In their joint thesis "On the Science of Administration" M. I. Piskotin, B. M. Lasarev, N. G. Salisheva and Yu. A. Tikhomirov proposed establishing 'the science of administration' which pursues in a comprehensive way problems of 'administration' (управление) in all phases of social life. The aims of this science comprise: clarification of the essential nature and the substance of administrative processes of state and social affairs; systematization of administrative processes in economic and cultural branches, in enterprises, institutions and other organizations; rationalization of administrative systems and structures; and further democratizing improvement, based on the latest achievements in science and technology, of the forms and methods of the activity of administrative apparatus. This comprehensive science has in its framework fields of research such as governmental, legal, social, economic, psychological, technical, organizational, and each field is researched by respective social scientists. The science of administration is a 'complex' of all social and natural sciences which

28) Ibid., pp. 19-20, 22-4.

are 'related in some way or other to administration'. According to Piskotin, the greatest importance is attached to governmental and legal branches, or the science of 'state and administrative law', that are concerned with the rationalization and democratization of state administration and with the improvement of its administrative apparatus. This science should not only cultivate the independent field of its own, but also should coordinate its own study results with those of the other branches of science concerning general problems of state administration and synthesize those fruits of researches. It means that the entire body of the science of 'state and administrative law' is absorbed in the science of administration whereas the other branches of science are not. Therefore, the system of the concepts of the state and administrative law is transplanted in the science of administration to be used as general epistemological concepts in the study of administrative problems.<sup>29)</sup>

G. S. Yakovlev, however, refutes the preceding definitions of the science of administration offered by the jurists by pointing to the defects derived from their juristic viewpoint.

(A) *Proposal by Yakovlev of the Functional Approach.*

First, Yakovlev argues that these definitions are theoretically insufficient to prove that the science of administration is an independent branch of science. For a particular branch of knowledge to be recognized as a science, three things are necessary: (1) its proper object, (2) its proper method, and (3) its peculiar concepts or laws, or its characteristic system of knowledge. But, the preceding definitions, being disqualified as to items (2) and (3), will reduce the science of administration to a mere essentially synchronized junction of various sorts of informations and skills that are required of administrative and economic specialists or active persons, or a mere complex of various sorts of odds and ends. He says the definitions do not explain as to how these bits of knowledge are to be evolved into a new organic scientific discipline, or on what theoretical basis is to be constructed a new scientific complex, or what is the theoretical meaning of the 'mark' (признак) by which 'relation to administration' can be ascertained.<sup>30)</sup>

29) См. М. И. Пискотин, Б. М. Лазарев, Н. Г. Салишева, Ю. А. Тихомиров, *О науке управления*, «Советское Государство и Право» (M. I. Piskotin, B. M. Lasarev, N. G. Salisheva, Yu. A. Tikhomirov: *On the Science of Administration*, "Soviet State and Law"), 1964, No. 9, pp. 15-7, 20-7.

30) См. Г. С. Яковлев, *О методах, содержании и структуре научного знания о области управления*, «Советское Государство и Право» (G. S. Yakovlev: *On the Methodics, Aspects and Organization of Scientific Knowledge in the Sphere of State Administration*, "Soviet State and Law"), 1965, No. 4, p. 90.

Next, Yakovlev questions the system of the whole concepts of administrative law which is to be transplanted into the science of administration. Although these concepts — 'the work of execution and the administrative disposal', 'organs', 'service', 'civil servant' and so on — are abstracted in the science of administrative law which conducts researches of administration from a limited narrow viewpoint, by means of general scientific method by which complexities are dissolved into elements each of which is analyzed either individually or interactionally, yet judging by the standards of legal study, these concepts are effective. He never denies the possibility of using those concepts for the study of 'organization' and 'administration', but they completely forbid the 'functional' study of the administrative process. In the functional approach to administrative processes, the focus of attention moves from the question of types that asks what the thing is to the problem of how it functions. The concepts of administrative law are not only 'descriptive', but 'of little capacity' and unfit for functional analysis.<sup>31)</sup>

The defects we have seen in the concepts of administrative law are evident in the definition of the concept of 'administration' which is the basic concept in the science of administration. In the science of administrative law, administration is often defined as executive and administrative activities (the work of execution and the administrative disposal). But, this definition merely shows the reflection of directly visible facts or of tangible activities in tangible fields, and none of deep reflection on the mechanism of the administrative process. That is why the concepts or the definitions in the science of administrative law, though fully adequate on the level of the legal study, show themselves insufficient and defective in the functional approach to the problems of administration. For instance, Piskotin's argument in the above-mentioned thesis that the essential nature and the substance of administrative processes differ, in spite of their common features, according to the functions of organs and to the quantity and character of objects subordinated to them, is indeed correct on legal level, but it is open to refutation in the functional approach. The administrative processes in all areas, in spite of the various differences and diversities which arise from the character of environment in which they are performed, have an inherent common character. This common character goes deeper than the mere agreement

---

31) *Ibid.*, p. 91.

of marks of executive and administrative activity on which the concepts of administrative law in administration are based. This theoretically common character is not to be explained from the viewpoint of concepts or theories of administrative law. It is only from a deeper general perspective that the administrative processes can be grasped as 'isomorphic'. It is also the perspective on which 'information theory', one of the basic theories of cybernetics, is based. Today, the system of the concepts and categories of cybernetics are applied to various domains of natural science as a common instrument (apparatus) in scientific understandings. Theories of cybernetics, especially concepts of information and categories of feedback coupling, are applied to the science of administration to make it possible to grasp completely the inherent common character ('isomorphism') of the administrative processes in all areas, thereby insuring the construction of general theories of administration.<sup>32)</sup>

From the viewpoint of information theory, the administrative process is represented as the system of informations, that is, as the process of creation, transmission and processing of informations. The representation of the administrative process as a form of informational process means reduction in some way or other of the tangible operation of various kinds and varieties into the operation of informations. This reduction can clarify the theoretically common character of administrative mechanism. In the study of the administrative process as an aspect of information, the characteristics of actual bearers of information are abstracted, but this abstraction will give an impetus to the over-all functional study of administrative processes in all areas of social life. Also, the informational representation and the functional explication of the administrative process will make it possible to build up a general theoretical model of state-administrative system.<sup>33)</sup>

As fundamental principles of administration in the Soviet state are cited those of socialist democracy, and as principles of organization and activity of state-administrative apparatus are cited the mass participation in state administration, democratic centralization, socialistic legality and principles of planning and account. But, in the science of administration, laws peculiar to organization and administration should be treated. In the functional study of organization and administration, several characteristics of various processes are

32) *Ibid.*, pp. 91-3.

33) *Ibid.*, p. 94.

abstracted, and attention should be concentrated on the mechanism of function. Various elements and factors characteristic of organization and administration are abstracted, and their functional connection and informational character are examined. In some cases, in so far as elements and factors can be mathematically quantified, the method of mathematical model and other mathematical means are used. This model makes it feasible to make a comparative estimation of the interrelations of structure and function and of the efficacy of a given structure.<sup>34)</sup>

According to Yakovlev, the functional mechanism of administrative system is not of the linear type of causal interrelation, but a complex system where reaction of results upon causes is incessantly at work. The proper expression of the structure of this complex system is the concept of 'feedback coupling'. That is, the mechanism of administrative system is explained as the link that connects the transmission and return of information — the structure of feedback.<sup>35)</sup>

Thus, Yakovlev seems to have found a great significance in the introduction of cybernetics to the science of administration, in that cybernetic theory can afford a new angle to the clarification of administrative problems, thus making it possible to construct a general theory of administration.

(B) The Proposed 'Systematic Approach' by Ts. A. Yampolskaya.

Yampolskaya says that the indispensable and foremost duty of the science of administration is to work out the optimum variants of the organization and function of various 'state administrative organs'<sup>36)</sup> and systems, and asserts that 'system approach' is inevitable in this study. That is to say, the approach aims to consider the mechanism of the administrative process by representing it as a dynamically functioning complex 'integral system' without separating individual elements from each other of respective organs of administration and their systems. Yampolskaya, further, says that the use of 'general system theory' after taking into consideration the characteristics of objects, or those of the elements of the system, will give a clue to the recognition of many yet unknown aspects of phenomena and processes that are under consideration.<sup>37)</sup>

34) Ibid., p. 95.

35) Ibid., pp. 100-1.

36) Yampolskaya, here, uses 'state administration' in the narrow sense. The term 'organs of state administration' or 'state administrative organs', therefore, are synonymous with 'organs of execution and the administrative disposal'.

37) См. Ц. А. Ямпольская, К методологии науки управления, «Советское Государство и Право» (Ts. A. Yampolskaya: A Methodology of the Science of Administration, "Soviet State and Law"), 1965, No. 8, p. 12.

According to the system theory, the system of state administrative organs is in itself one element of a more complex system and at the same time consists of less complex systems. Hence, the following dynamically functioning complex integral system:

(1) The system of political organizations of the Soviet society (the totality of systems of state organs and of those of social organizations such as political parties, Komsomol, trade unions).

(2) The system of Soviet state organs (the unity of the systems of Soviet representative organs, of state administrative organs, and of judicial organs).

(3) The system of state administrative organs.

(4) Systems of divisional (vertical) organs of administration, of regional (horizontal, such as U.S.S.R., Union Republics, Regions and Districts) organs of administration, and systems of administrative organs of general competence and those of specialized competence.

(5) Individual organs of state administration, each of which constitutes an independent system comprising as its own elements component parts such as departments, bureaus, center, etc.<sup>38)</sup>

Now these are the characteristics of the preceding systems: (a) each has its own composition, that is, that totality of elements, (b) each has its own structure, that is, the characteristics of interrelation between component parts of a given system, and (c) each has its own specific types of interaction with its environment, or the object of administration such as citizens who are to be served. Each system is an 'integral system' in the sense that these three characteristics are observed in each.<sup>39)</sup>

Among the preceding systems (3) (4) (5) are summed up under the term 'administrative system'. For the study of this administrative system, general theories on the integral system and methodological means are available. And by their use, new developments are anticipated of the rationalization of state administration and of improvement of state apparatus. Although it is not feasible to present here all the concrete examples of the new phases of this new study, yet the following are already evident: (a) the examination and clarification of the marks ('признаки') or the nature of administrative system is given priority of concentrated attention on condition that the 'functional synthesis' (функцио-

38) Ibid., p. 13.

39) Ibid., p. 14.

нирующая совокупность) of various organs of state administration is duly qualified as an 'integral system', (b) by the help of the system approach, it is possible to discover all the marks (признаки) of administrative system as a whole by descending from the general to the particular, that is, from the political system of the Soviet society down to the system of Soviet state apparatus, to the system of state administration. Further, the 'integral system' through the interaction of its elements produces a new integral quality (that is, a quality resulting from the integration of elements), and the examination and clarification of individual special qualities of all the systems of administrative organs and each of the component parts (sub-systems) that constitute them, will provide particularly interesting material.<sup>40)</sup>

The study of the system approach clarifies in the following order the interrelation of elements in each system, that is, the structure of each system. First, the interrelations in each organ (each system). Second, the interrelations in the administrative system of each branch. Thirdly and finally, the interrelations in the whole system of administrative organs. The main character of the interrelations of elements (that is, departments, bureaus, centres) in each organ (each system) is parallel. That is to say, to one leader are subordinate the constituent departments and bureaus. The basic character of the administrative system in each branch is hierarchic relationship (leadership and subordination). There are parallel or coordinative relations, but they do not play an important part. The important special quality in the administrative system in branches is its 'two-fold form of subordination' (двойное подчинение), that is, subordination both to the organ of general authority (or competence) at each level (Soviets, Executive Committee, Council of ministers) and to the higher-ranking organs in divisional administration. The interrelations in the whole administrative system are more complex and need an over-all comprehensive analysis and examination. Their characteristics will be revealed in a comparative study with the interrelations in each administrative system.<sup>41)</sup>

The study of the interrelations of elements in each system will lead to the analysis of information, which means that an analysis will be made as to the nature of source and passage of informations that flow into the system, and at

40) Ibid., pp. 13, 14-5.

41) Ibid., p. 15.

the same time as to the nature of receptors of informations that go out of the system. All informations relating to the administrative system will be divided in two basic groups: (1) the informations that circulate within the system (or in each of its ranks or parts), (2) the informations that circulate between the system and its environment. The study of the first group clarifies the characteristics and the mechanism of leadership exercised within the system. The method and the tempo of the circulation of informations will be the indicator of effectiveness of the inner structure of the system. In the study of the second group, the outcome and the effectiveness of activity on the part of a given system will be clarified. The examination of this problem is important since administrative system is after all the one that acts not on itself but on its objects. Also, this study is significant in clarifying from the side of the higher organ (system) the mechanism of leadership in a given system. The comparative estimation as to the substance and intensity of the flow of informations that come into a given system from the higher organ (system) and those of the flow of informations within the system that go from a higher rank to a lower, will reveal the efficiency of activity of the leaders of the system. (For instance, a comparison of the informations from the organs of U.S.S.R. (or All-Union organs) to Councils of Ministers of the Union Republics, with that from the Conncil of Ministers to its lower organs.)<sup>42)</sup>

The informations in the first group can be divided in three, according to the direction in which the informations go: (a) the informations that flow within the system from the higher to the lower organs, (b) the informations that flow within the system among analogous or identical types of parallel ranks, and (c) the flow of informations from the lower to the higher ranks (organs). The last flow of informations take various forms such as those of the responsibility of the lower organs to the higher or those of the proposal of new problems through the initiative of the lower organs. The administrative system needs to have the mechanism established that insures the maximum flow of these informations. Yampolskaya points out that only an insufficient examination has so far been made regarding the structure of this 'feed back'. The structure of feedback is peculiar to the integral system. By grasping from the viewpoint of 'system theory' or 'information theory' the control system in the state administration as a

42) *Ibid.*, p. 15-6.

mechanism of feedback, effective solution of various problems is expected such as the combination and the interrelation of various forms and methods of control, or those of effectiveness of control. Also from this standpoint it is feasible to utilize the method of 'system modeling' (моделирование системы).<sup>43)</sup>

Thus, Yampolskaya argues that the study of the system of state administration based upon the 'system approach' opens up an entirely new viewpoint and perspective.

### Conclusion

A further development of Soviet economy and a further progress of science and technology are expected to make the systems of the leadership and administration in all areas such as governmental, economic, social, cultural, etc. both gigantic and higher in quality as well as in scale. Along with this, the quantity will vastly increase of the informations that are to be created and communicated in connexion with the problems of leadership, planning, administration, control, etc. Then, the disposition, its speed and accuracy, of informations will be a grave issue. V. M. Glushkov says that provided the quality level of 1960 planning be regarded as the standard, the processing of informations that will arise from the amount of production expected in 1980, will require the whole adult population of the U.S.S.R. to engage in administrative spheres. He argues that the only way to solution is to bring about a settled employment in the domain of administration of those means of modern technology and automation which have been used in the domain of material production.<sup>44)</sup> For automated disposition of informations in the administrative system, cybernetic principles and techniques will be widely used.<sup>45)</sup> It is expected that "the effect of cybernetic models and their areas of application are quite limited in the capitalist economy

43) Ibid., p. 16-8.

44) См. В. М. Глушков, Мышление и кибернетика, «Вопросы Философии» (V. M. Glushkov: Thinking and Cybernetics, "Problems of Philosophy"), 1963, No. 1, p. 44-5.

45) The new Programme of C.P.S.U. says: "In the 20 years comprehensive automation will be effected on a mass scale, with increasing emphasis on fully automated shops and factories, making for high technical and economic efficiency. Introduction of the very latest systems of automated control will be speeded up. Cybernetics, electronic computer and control system will be widely applied in production processes in dustry, building and transport, in scientific research, planning, designing, accounting, statistics, and management." (Программа КПСС, 1961, стр. 71.)

where panics recur, but there is an unlimited possibility of its expansion under socialist or communist economy.”<sup>46)</sup>

Situations like this cannot fail to exert a great deal of influence over the theoretical application in the science of administration of cybernetics as well as over its technological and practical application. Theories and concepts of cybernetics will be wholly adopted as effective and indispensable devices or analytic means in the study of the science of administration. The application for the problems of administration of the cybernetic theories signifies representation of actual administrative systems as systems of information and control, and leads to the discussion of common characteristics (‘isomorphism’) regarding the information and control in each area. There, the actual systems are deprived in an abstract way of their realistic social qualities and differences, and common informational qualities and ‘isomorphic’ relationships are picked out. Also, some of the central themes will be the structure of feedback and the conditions of its smooth functioning, that is, problems of relationships of interdependence between structure and function or those of general laws of the function (functionalizing) of systems. Further, this abstraction process insures the possibility of modeling the actual complex processes of administration. The purpose of the modeling method is to construct analogues of the objects and to create the epistemological ideas that reflect completely and more deeply the objects, for models are not the ‘icons’ (образы) of objects in a philosophical sense,<sup>47)</sup> but merely a tool for acquiring knowledge of the objects. To quote M. Rozen-tali, he says that “The modeling method contains as its important element the experiment (or experimentation). Models allow analogues of the objects of study to be made, and moreover, depending on the methods of experimentation, allow the nature of objects, their influence, their working, their effectiveness to be explained. Socialist society is amply capable of social experimentation.”<sup>48)</sup> Information theories of cybernetics and modeling methods make it feasible to

46) “Yuibutsu-ron Kenkyū (Study of Materialism)”, (The quarterly magazine of the Japanese association for the study of materialism), No. 18, p. 60.

47) См. А. А. Зиновьев, И. И. Ревзин, Логическая модель как средство научного исследования, «Вопросы Философии» (A. A. Zinoviev, I. I. Revzin: Logical Model as a Means of the Scientific Research, “Problems of Philosophy”), 1960, No. 1, p. 83.

48) М. Розенталь, Теория познания и современные научные достижения, «Коммунист» (M. Rozental: Epistemology and Contemporary Scientific Achievement, “Communist”), 1965, No. 8, p. 26.

explore and finish the variants of the optimum and rational system of administration. "Cybernetics has contributed to expanding human understanding in two important areas. One opened the way to the quantified way of understanding of the control process; the other formulated the rational method of understanding and acquiring the complex, dynamic system."<sup>49)</sup> The application of cybernetics to the study of administrative system will make a significant and valuable contribution to the development of the study, in that the application will heighten the possibility of "turning a descriptive science into any experimental one that utilizes an exact quantitative method."<sup>50)</sup>

However, these warnings should be fully noted. Cybernetics "has its utility and its limitations in so far as it remains an abstract of a certain aspect of a phenomenon, and will turn into an erroneous 'mechanism' when this fact is forgotten."<sup>51)</sup> Cybernetics works "in the understanding of the wide areas of self-controlled technical processes and of certain problems that admit of analogy in an apparent functional relation with them," but if it is applied without limitation or distinction "beyond its sound efficacy (pertinence)," it will be as guilty of a great error as "disposing of cybernetics as a pseudo-science."<sup>52)</sup> Cybernetics is no 'science of sciencies' nor is it 'a philosophy'. It is simply an operation or a means for scientific understanding. The introduction of cybernetic theories into the science of administration does not mean the wholesale conversion of administrative processes to the domain of cybernetics. Therefore, we cannot deny the existence of a certain restriction (limited areas of applicability) on the extent of contribution that cybernetic theories can make to the science of administration.

Whatever the estimate of cybernetics, in the advocacy of the science of administration and in the discussion of application of cybernetic theories that I have so far considered, there is an obvious practical. (or utilitarian) intention to meet the actual problems that confront the Soviet society today. But at the same time, we may say that at bottom they are consciously trying to solve the problems regarding the 'principles and laws of the functionalization of administration' without confusing the problem of "how the new class administers" and

49) "Yuibutsu-ron Kenkyū (Study of Materialism)", No. 15, p. 44.

50) A. A. Ляпунов, А. И. Китов, Кибернетика в технике и экономике, «Вопросы Философии» (A. A. Lyapnov, A. I. Kitov: Cybernetics in Technology and Economics, "Problems of philosophy"), 1961, No. 9, p. 85.

51) "Yuibutsu-ron Kenkyū (Study of Materialism)", No. 18, p. 46.

52) "Yuibutsu-ron Kenkyū (Study of Materialism)", No. 18, p. 88.

that of "in what respect the class rule is making its appearance," namely, without converting the former into the latter or in other words the problems of 'production relations', and also they have an epistemological and methodological intention to have an increased degree of recognition of functionalistic concepts such as those of 'structure', 'function', 'interaction (interrelation)'. Although the arguments I have considered in this paper do not completely satisfy these theoretical urges either by explanation or by solution, yet it seems that by proposing some new problems they indicate a certain orientation.