

## THE ESSENCE OF ADMINISTRATION : THE DIVISION OF LABOUR, AUTHORITY, AND HIERARCHY

Doç. Dr. KURTHAN FIŞEK

### I

Hegel once remarked that the Owl of Minerva begins its flight only when twilight gathers. **However late, it begins.** Yet, considering the present controversial state of «administrative science» and the fact that the unending debate and dispute on administrative theory still remains to be transcended, one hesitates to share Hegel's historical optimism and tends to regard the scheduled coming of administrative wisdom and concensus as **better late than never.** Why this apparent pessimism? Probably because an impressive procession of administrative apostles, from Taylor to Mayo to Gulick to Simon, and a rapidly growing torrent of administrative recipes, from Fayol's «line system» to Taylor's «functional organization» to Mayo's portrayal of labour relations as «'humane' relations based on the Christian commandments» to the wishful thinking of the McGregors and Druckers, have inevitably and eventually failed to bridge the gap between academic fancy and organizational reality. Why this failure? Probably because concrete facts, by their very nature, refuse to accommodate preconceived ideas. Either that, or, the founding-fathers and apostles of «administrative science» intentionally overlook, what all participants in administration **never forget.**

Administration, as «the organizing activities of a hierarchical superior», finds expression in the regulation of social life, manifests itself in the diverse and distinctive activities (and interaction) of a myriad of organizational forms, **but, above all, implies a rule over and submission of people.** Administrative science, as preached by its apostles, tends to concentrate on the former (i.e. the structure and **modus operandi** of administration), but, for all practical purposes, neglects the latter (i.e. the **raison d'être** of administration). Briefly, the crucial question is not how people submit, but, **why they submit.** As long as this question goes unanswered, prolonged

controversy will weigh heavily upon the independence (as a branch of science), viability and ultimate fate of «administrative science».

Actually, it comes as a surprise that such basic premises as «rule over people» and/or «submission of people» should be taken for granted and go undisputed. Certain attempts have been made to explain why people submit to the will of a synthetic (or alien) entity, but, to say the least, the overwhelming majority of these attempted explanations failed to fulfil the demands of the task it set out to perform, furthering not the understanding but the ambiguity of the **ordo ordinans** of administration. What, actually, is the precipitating cause of the absolute or conditional obedience of all to the will of one? Is it because individuals consciously give up their unrestricted personal freedoms by way of social contract and in favour of an apparatus to guarantee their welfare and safety (Rousseau),<sup>1</sup> or because «people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts toward organizational objectives» (McGregor),<sup>2</sup> or because managerial activity is «the development of people and not the direction of things» (Appley),<sup>3</sup> or because the aims of an administrative organization are «indirectly, a personal objective of all the participants..., whereby their organizational activity is bound together to achieve a satisfaction of their own diverse personal motives» (Simon)<sup>4</sup>? **Obscurum per obscurius!** Nothing else!

Rule over and submission of people, i.e. the *raison d'être* of administration, emanates from the economic basis of the «division of labour», is legitimized by the ethical concept of «authority», and finds self-expression in the gradation (stratification) of this authority through the external form of «hierarchy». These three concepts, bound together by the invisible threads of social life and **clothed in legal forms**, constitute the essence of administration. Before proceeding with our analysis of these basic elements of

---

(1) According to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the state or sovereign represents the General Will and is entitled to obedience on that account.

(2) Douglas McGregor, «The Human Side of Enterprise», **Adventure in Thought and Action** (Proceedings of the Fifth Anniversary Convocation of the MIT School of Industrial Management), Cambridge, Mass., 1957, P. 28.

(3) Lawrence A. Appley, «Management the Simple Way», **Personnel**, vol. 19, no. 4, January 1943, p. 598.

(4) Herbert A. Simon, **Administrative Behavior**, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1945, p. 17.

administration, however, a short and proper account of the relationship between administrative and legal science seems required.

## II

Administrative science originates at the intersecting point of a wide variety of disciplines and, as such, assumes the exclusive character of an **interdisciplinary branch of knowledge**. This relative newcomer in the field of social sciences, however, is neither the «hybrid», nor the «combination» of the various branches of knowledge, but, rather, their «synthesis». Briefly, by applying the artifacts of a variety of disciplines to concrete situations as reflected in the processes pertaining to the administration of the diverse aspects of social life, administrative science deals with the general questions of administration based upon and within the framework of universal theoretical principles and conclusions. While studying and integrating the significant characteristics of a specific field of enquiry, however, the science of administration is inevitably influenced and even conditioned by the content and techniques of that given branch of administration (e.g. economy and politics) and its corresponding branch of knowledge. The resulting dilemma of administrative science, i.e. the contradiction between the necessity of interdisciplinary integration and the pre-conditions of disciplinary independence, can be resolved only by defining the precise nature of its relations to and interdependence with other branches of knowledge. This holds particularly true for the relationship of administrative to legal science, as they are superstructurally interwoven.

Viewed from the attitudinal standpoint of the two major schools of administrative thought, namely the American and the Continental, we can differentiate between two basic types of preconceived relationships. Whereas the American school of administrative thought claims full and unreserved independence for the science of administration to the extent that legal science ceases to exist in the administrative realm, the Continental school (especially the French) asserts the direct opposite, i.e. total subordination of administrative to legal science. The assertions of both schools fail to qualify as «scientific reality», insofar as they misrepresent (through exaggeration) their respective sides of an otherwise two-sided fact. True, without law (or legal science) it is impossible

to organize and regulate properly the diverse aspects of social life in general, and administrative activity in particular. Equally true however, is the fact that the quality of legal science and the applicability of its prevailing sanctions depend upon the degree to which they validly and scientifically reflect the objective undercurrents of society and their corresponding relations of administration.

Legal science (or law), as a rule, **does not create but reflects**. Yet, the economic basis must assume an outward legal form if it is to receive legal sanction. All-embracing administrative (or organizational) activity, therefore, is clothed in legal forms and expressed in legal terminology; this outward legal form, in turn, becomes a legal framework demarcating and regulating organizational activity. More specifically, problems pertaining to **the outward form of administrative content** (e.g. the principles and safeguards of organizational structure, intra-organizational rights and responsibilities, administrative jurisdiction, the coordination of the activities of superior and subordinate bodies, provision for a fixed set of rules to select, assign and motivate personnel, etc.), come within the sphere of activity of legal science. In short, administrative science, in searching for and developing the most effective means of planning, guidance and control of organizational activity, fixes its findings in law and with the assistance of legal science affirms a scientific approach to their utilization.

Summing up our account of the relationship of administrative to legal science, it can be concluded that the basic elements of administration, as a rule, outwardly assume a legal form and are thereby endowed «social legitimacy» and assured of a smooth and sanctioned operation. This «organic» relationship between administrative and legal science will be taken up intermittently, when dealing with the inborn association and interdependence of the division of labour, authority and hierarchy.

### III

**The division of labour** is to society what «original sin» is to theology. In other words, it is not only the beginning, but, also, the underpinning. The original division of labour took place in the sexual act. With an increase in population and productivity, this simple division of labour between the sexes was replaced by a spontaneous division of labour according to social need and natural predisposition. As the historical consequence of further incre-

ases in labour productivity and the resulting cleavage of society into the rulers and the ruled, the division of labour assumed the outward appearance of the separation of mental from physical labour. Ultimately and in due course, man became «a well-disciplined and regulated automaton with specialized technical knowledge and a generalized ignorance and indifference as to his position and purpose in the organization and in society in general».<sup>5</sup> The division of labour not only creates, but, also, consolidates and perpetuates this position.

The division of labour, as the economic basis of administration, denotes the process of disjunction and interdependent existence of different kinds of labour activities within a single system of production. The nature and effects of the division of labour are apparent in the following much-quoted observation:<sup>6</sup>

The division of labour implies... the mutual interdependence of the individuals among whom the labour is divided... The division of labour offers us the first example of how, as long as... activity is not voluntarily but naturally divided, man's own deed becomes an alien power opposed to him, which enslaves him instead of being controlled by him. For as soon as labour is distributed, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape..., if he does not want to lose his means of livelihood.

Though appearing as the natural form of cooperation between individuals and reflecting the universality of dependence, the division of labour actually rivets the individual to a specific labour operation for life and causes him to become «a simple cog in an ever-moving mechanism which prescribes to him an essentially fixed route of march».<sup>7</sup> This coexistence of the progressive and reactionary can best be understood by way of a retrospective estimation of the situation.<sup>8</sup> In primitive society, where kinship was

---

(5) Nicos p. Mouzelis, *Organisation and Bureaucracy*, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London, 1969, p. 36.

(6) Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, «The German Ideology», *Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy* (ed. Lewis S. Feuer), Doubleday and Co. Inc., New York, 1959, p. 254.

(7) H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1946, p. 228.

(8) For a detailed account of the following analysis, refer to author's unpublished associate professorship dissertation, *Participation in Management*; also see Gordon Childe, *What Happened in History*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, England, 1964.

matrilinear (due to communal marriage) and no cleavage existed between the rulers and the ruled (due to the predominance of women in the collective economy), the division of labour was a simple one between sexes and according to age. With the harnessing of oxen to the plough and the development of bronze and ferrous metallurgy, primitive society underwent a radical transformation. Predominantly characterized by man's newly-acquired ability to produce, reproduce and over-produce his means of existence, and accompanied by gradual transitions from the female task of plot-cultivation to the male task of field-tillage, from matriarchy to father-right, and from communal ownership to patriarchal sovereignty over family patrimony and members, these profound changes were both realized and consolidated by the first and second social divisions of labour, namely the separation of agriculture first from animal husbandry and then from the handicrafts. The earlier stages of slave-owning society witnessed yet another division, that between physical and mental labour; thus, some people were freed from arduous manual labour and enabled to engage exclusively in the development of culture and technology. These earlier forms of the division of labour proved instrumental in bringing into existence the hitherto non-existent administrative forms of organization, thereby consolidating and institutionalizing the cleavage between the rulers and the ruled. With the harnessing of steam-power to production and the advent of the Age of Machines, the processes of production began to shed their «individual» character and became more and more a «social» act; consequently, the aging and hitherto spontaneous forms of the division of labour (e.g. cooperation between corporate guilds) were replaced by the forerunner of present-day forms, i.e. **division of labour, according to parts and details, based upon a preconceived and definite plan, and within the workshop.**

This historical estimation of the situation shows that the division of labour is causally tied in with the emergence and development of administration (to the extent that it creates and consolidates administration), and that an inverse relationship exists between the degree of complexity of productive activity and the magnitude of the specific task performed by the individual. The general trend, which finds self-expression in the increasing complexity of the act of production and the growing interdependence of the various spheres of social life, reaches its climax with the strictly bourgeois phenomenon of «division of labour within the

workshop» and eventually results in man becoming a mere appendage to his own creation, the machine.

Even as the natural processes of differentiation continue without losing their distinctive characteristics, the controversial case of the division of labour remains polarized around the rational and the moral, ranging from blind worship to total condemnation. Since, however, the usefulness of the division of labour is not negated under the present-day conditions of production, we propose to restrict our closing remarks to its «economic mission» and relations with outward legal forms. Firstly, as each individual has a specified sphere of competence and since «incumbents are chosen on the basis of... ability to perform specialized aspects of a total operation»,<sup>9</sup> the individual is expected to perform more successfully and productively. Secondly, the disjunction of a complex act of production into simple elements and the assignment of a qualified person to the performance of this basic task, if properly coordinated and executed, will act as a time-saving device. Finally, as the act of production becomes more and more mechanical, the time-consuming influences of personal factors are first neutralized and then replaced by a purely impersonal man-to-task relationship. These three factors, at the present-day stage of economic development, constitute the «economic mission» of the division of labour. As for its relationship with legal forms, it can be stated that the division of labour is institutionalized by strict procedural rules. These legal norms and rules are absolutely essential for the smooth and efficient functioning of the division of labour, insofar as they impose discipline and control, restrict individual initiative and hence arbitrary action, qualify the objective demands of the task-at-hand and thus ensure predictability of performance, coordinate the formalized relationships between various specializations, and assure the planning, control and verification of implementation. This internal relationship between specialized acts of production and their external relationship to the artifacts of legal science find self-expression in «the existence of a system of control based on rational rules... which try to regulate the whole organizational structure and process on the basis of technical knowledge and with the aim of maximum efficiency».<sup>10</sup> Hence, modern technology, as reflected in «division of labour within the workshop», imposes

---

(9) John M. Pfiffner and Frank P. Sherwood, *Administrative Organization*, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1962, p. 56.

upon the individual an alien will verging on despotism. But, apparently, we have run ahead in time. Turning back, we recommence our analysis of the basic elements of administration with the assertion that **the division of labour, by its very nature, generates authority.**

#### IV

Long before the transformation of production from an individual into a social act and the ultimate replacement of isolated by combined action of individuals, and originally as far back as the appearance of the very first man-like creatures,<sup>11</sup> life in society necessitated the existence of certain organizational forms. Whether they be the purely functional and elective offices of matriarchy, or the strictly administrative institutions of class society, these organizational forms possessed over social life a universally recognized influence deriving from certain qualities or services performed. True, these forms, in the course of development of socio-historical practice, transformed themselves from servants into masters of society; but, that is quite another question. The basic problem here is to properly and fully comprehend the nature and workings of these organizational forms.

Social organization inevitably implies the existence of a division of labour, whatever its form. The division of labour, in turn and by its very nature, generates and perpetuates authority. Hence, our basic problem, i.e. the search for an organizational motive force, is reduced to the problem of understanding **the nature and modus operandi of authority.** The concept of «authority» has been defined in a multitude of ways. Whether it be «the right to give orders and the power to exact obedience»,<sup>12</sup> or «a system of normatively sanctioned power»,<sup>13</sup> or «the sanctioned exercise of indirect coercion»,<sup>14</sup> or «the relationship that exists between individuals..., when the individual receiving the directive weighs the consequences

---

(10) Mouzelis, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

(11) Read 2,000,000 years.

(12) Henry Fayol, *General and Industrial Management*, Pitman Publishing Corp., London, 1949, p. 21.

(13) Robert Bierstadt, «The Problem of Authority», *Management in Perspective* (eds. Schlender et al.). Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1965, p. 465.

(14) *Ibid.*, p. 465.



of rejecting it and decides in favour of acceptance»,<sup>15</sup> **authority presupposes subordination** and expresses a specific relationship of submission and domination. As such, «authority» assumes the outward appearance of an ethical concept denoting the imposition of one will upon the other, and can be defined as **the will that decides in the last resort**. It is the renunciation, on the part of the subordinate, of all will of its own and submission to the command of an alien will; reciprocally, it is the usurpation of pre-eminence over all subordinates by a «superior» individual, system of views or organizational body. In short, authority is identified predominantly with the rights of the superiors and the responsibilities of the subordinates.<sup>16</sup>

For every stage of economic development and its underlying division of labour there exists a corresponding form of authority. In primitive matriarchal society, where kinship was reckoned along the female line and the division of labour was a simple one between the sexes, no institutionalized cleavage existed between the rulers and the ruled, authority was predominantly **matriarchal and informal**, and pre-administrative forms of organization maintained a temporary, functional and elective character. With the advent of the Age of Metals and its revolutionary impact on military technology, predominantly personified by the bronze-rapier and iron broadsword, «a man who has distinguished himself as a 'war-chief, (in matriarchal society often a temporary and elective office) has a chance of consolidating his authority on an economic basis by wealth in cattle and servants».<sup>17</sup> Thus began society's transition from communal to private property, from matriarchy to patriarchal rule, and from temporary to hereditary authority. On the other hand, whereas the woman's shoulders were the oldest means of transport and the exacting drudgery of production fell to the lot of the women, the increasing use of the plough and animal motive power transferred all these burdens to the shoulders of some dumb beast.<sup>18</sup> Thus the economic basis of mother-right was destroyed and, in due course, class rule and its

---

(15) Daniel J. Duffy, «Authority Considered from an Operational Point of View», *Journal of the Academy of Management*, v. 2, no. 3 1959, p. 212.

(16) Authority should not be confused with power, which is the authoritative organization of the joint activities of men and expresses the capacity of dominant elements to define and regulate men's line of behaviour.

(17) Childe, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-95.

(18) *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

patriarchal forms of administrative organization came into existence. Based on and perpetuated by the first and second social divisions of labour, «patriarchal rule» demands subordination and loyalty in return for protection, and is more or less synonymous with the fact that «authority usually resides in a single individual, the head of the family, and is not as a rule shared with other family members, much less outsiders».<sup>19</sup> With the harnessing of steampower to production and the appearance of machines, the division of labour and resultingly, authority assumes an intra-organizational character, becoming well-defined and functioning according to a pre-conceived plan. This form of authority, conceived under modern conditions of production, is a function of formal organization and, as a rule, is exercised in accordance with specific statutory norms and regulations. These legal forms and framework, however, do not constitute the sole sanction of authority, but, rather, buttress the pattern spontaneously generated by modern technology. In concluding our remarks on the nature and functioning of authority, a brief account of the organic relationship between modern technology and authority is called for.

Owing to the extensive use of machines in modern industry and the high degree of specialization it involves, individual initiative is limited to a minimum and persons are given specific tasks which are to be performed in a certain way, within a fixed period of time, and under certain material conditions. Hence, the individual, under modern conditions of production and in his relationship to the machine, tends to become the appendage of his own creation. On the other hand, the increasing complexity and diversity of the act of production necessitates that this act be broken down into its simple, restricted and specific components. This basic phenomenon not only establishes and institutionalizes the interdependence of the basic components of productive activity, but, also, without compelling the use of any external sanction other than the act of production itself, rivets the individual to a specific labour operation for life and forces him to conform to a strict pattern of behaviour. Thus, it can be claimed truthfully that modern technology is more authoritarian than the most despotic of employers. Finally, large-scale production, by its very nature, necessitates the cooperation of a great many individuals and the

---

(19) Eugene W. Burgess, «Management in France», *Management in the Industrial World* (eds. Harbison and Myers), McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1959, p. 212.

coordination of their respective activities. Just as authority and subordination are things imposed upon us together with the material conditions of productive activity, so, «authority» assumes the form of a **dominant will that settles all subordinate questions** and acquires the inherent tendency to enlarge its scope parallel to the proliferation of large-scale industry. As «management by sovereign rule is not viable except in small-scale operations, and... tends to disappear in large-scale enterprise»,<sup>20</sup> the material and technical basis of the growth in organization-size necessitates the stratification (gradation) of authority, if authority is to exist as such. Thus, **the hierarchy comes into being.**

## V

Under modern conditions of production, the absence of hierarchy is more or less synonymous with the absence of authority. Causally related to the division of labour and existing in all organizations of a certain magnitude and complexity, hierarchy, in the sense of «levels of authority», is both the **stratified structural expression**, and the compelling force of authority. Whether it be in «line organization», where each superior has several subordinates but each subordinate has only one direct superior, or in the more complex «functional organization», which admits the subordination of an individual to several superiors each of whom is in charge of particular problems within his competence, the basic principle of hierarchy is that «each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one».<sup>21</sup> So, as one moves upwards within a hierarchy, authority tends to increase cumulatively until, eventually, dominance of will resides in the uppermost rung of the hierarchical ladder. In short, **hierarchy inherently perpetuates the pre-assumed institutions of subordination and domination.** The following excerpt provides insight into this side of the «nature» of hierarchy:<sup>22</sup>

The organizational hierarchy can be considered as a role system...  
The superior has the right to accept or reject the proposals of...  
and exact obedience, respect and loyalty from his subordinates...  
The role of the subordinate is to perform the duties corresponding

---

(20) Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myers (eds.), *Management in the Industrial World*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1959, p. 119.

(21) Pfiffner and Sherwood, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

(22) Oğuz Onaran, *Örgütlerde Karar Verme*, SBF Pub., Ankara, 1971, p. 233.

to these rights... The role of the superior is ultimately identified with rights, whereas that of the subordinate is based upon duties.

Apparently, this duality of character, personified by hierarchy, is some-what similar to the reciprocity of rights and responsibilities embodied in the ethical concept of authority. Now, some remarks **on why authority is stratified.** As mentioned earlier, management by sovereign rule is the product of and viable only in small-scale enterprise, which «gives impetus to an authoritarian type of management»,<sup>23</sup> and enables «the assumption of full direction of the enterprise by the head of the family without an adequate organization».<sup>24</sup> With an increase in the magnitude of organization and the degree of complexity of the act of production, the ability of a single individual to efficiently control and supervise the functioning of the proliferated parts and details of production rapidly transforms itself into an inherent inability to do so. The basic demand of intra-organizational division of labour (or specialization) is, therefore, the product of the contradiction between the necessity to coordinate the activities of subordinate persons (or parts) and the inability to do so where large numbers of subordinates are concerned. Thus, work is divided into small parts and the workers into small groups corresponding to these parts; each person (or task) is provided with an immediate superior to control and regulate the functioning of the various subordinates; and, **through the agencies of this hierarchic division of labour, a correspondingly stratified structure of authority comes into existence.**

As to how authority is stratified, we can distinguish between three historical types of hierarchy corresponding to the three major stages of the hitherto development of society. Excepting the pre-administrative organizational forms of matriarchy because of their non-hierarchic character, it can be asserted that the history of hierarchy begins with the application of durable metals (bronze and iron) to production and warfare, and assumes the prototypical shape of an interim military structure characterizing the transition from matriarchal to class rule. Instrumental in organizing society's defensive and offensive activities, this military hierarchy was topped by the permanent (later hereditary) office of «war-chief», and reflected a simple rank gradation of sub-chiefs and warriors. With the transition to slave-owning (and later feudal) society, this

---

(23) Burgess, *ap. cit.*, p. 216.

(24) *Ibid.*, p. 217.

simple hierarchic division of society, based on the reciprocity of services rendered to spoils, was eventually replaced by a complicated arrangement of society into various orders with a manifold gradation of rank and hereditary ties of subordination. This hierarchy of social estates, assuming under feudalism the outward shape of a «hierarchy of social rank corresponding to the hierarchy of fiefs through the process of sub-infeudation»<sup>25</sup> is based on a cleavage where groups are distinguished by their hereditary status and legal place in society. Absolute and impregnable authority is personified by the head of the patriarchal family. With the decay of feudalism, a process accelerated by the harnessing of steam-power to production (resulting in increased enterprise-size) and climaxed by the annihilation of aristocratic intermediate grades (resulting in the creation of a uniform level of relationships), the hitherto intra-societal nature of hierarchy is replaced by a predominantly intra-organizational stratification (gradation) of authority. Just as the division of labour is realized and exercised **within** the organization, so intra-organizational structure, in the last resort, is wrought after the plan of a systematic and hierarchic division of labour. Just as administration by way of a permanent army of non-elective, irrevocable and privileged officials (i.e. bureaucracy)<sup>26</sup> becomes the societal order of the day, so, intra-organizational behaviour comes under the control of strict rational rules of procedure as expressed and sanctioned by a hierarchical structure of authority with limited areas of command and responsibility.

Finally, the relationship of hierarchy to the tools of legal science go without saying. Weber, in asserting the rationality of so-called «bureaucratic administration», points out that «functional rationality is attained by the elaboration... of rules which try to direct from the top all behaviour towards maximum efficiency».<sup>27</sup> The resulting hierarchical structure, which reciprocally sanctions and is sanctioned by an all-inclusive legal framework, is not only the safeguard of smooth and efficient organizational operation, but, also, the direct product of a historical chain-reaction based upon the division of labour, perpetuated by authority and expressed exclusively in legal terminology.

---

(25) Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (trans. Henderson and Parsons), Oxford, 1947, p. 139.

(26) See Kurthan Fişek, «On Bureaucracy», *Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol. XXV, no. 2, Ankara, 1970, pp. 57-99.

(27) Mouzelis, *op. ct.*, p. 52.

## VI

In criticizing the prevalent form and content of administrative science, Mouzelis appropriately states that «knowledge about organisation cannot be systematized and grow by the mere accumulation of... myopic statements».<sup>28</sup> The scientific value of the study of administration is the direct outcome of the fact that, having emerged as a result of concrete studies carried out with the assistance of a variety of sciences, it objectively reflects and enables us to comprehend the essence of administration as related to social phenomena and historical processes.

Yet to be attained (as far as the present-day quality of administrative science is concerned), a full and proper understanding of the nature and operation of administration rests in the comprehension of the basic fact that the three basic elements of administration are causally and inseparably interwoven in the fabric of social life. Consequently, the hitherto elusive answer to the fundamental question of **why people submit to a will other than their own**, can be sought and found only in reference to the basic premise that «the predominant and imperious will» (authority) and «the stratification of authority» (hierarchy) are both the superstructural self-expression and the sanctioning force of «the disjunction and interdependent existence of various labour activities» (the division of labour).

---

(28) *Ibid.*, p. 179.