

YU. SUVARYAN
V. MIRZOYAN
R. HAYRAPETYAN

PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION:
THEORY AND HISTORY

EDUARD DANIELYAN

Doctor of History
Institute of History NAS RA
liparited@gmail.com

YU. SUVARYAN, V. MIRZOYAN, R. HAYRAPETYAN.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: THEORY AND HISTORY

Yerevan, "Gitutyun" Publishing House of the NAS RA, 2014, 300 pp.

The scholarly work of Yu. Suvaryan, V. Mirzoyan, R. Hayrapetyan is devoted to the essence and methodology of research of public administration: theory and history, based on comparative analysis of the works by ancient and medieval thinkers, particularly, Armenian and Western sources. Solutions to the assigned task are determined within the sphere of public administration as "a complete and recognized science" (dating back to the period from the last decades of the 19th c. to the first half of the 20th c.) with theoretical and practical concepts accumulated over centuries, and even constitutions serving as a basis for the formation and development of a complete and comprehensive theory. As noted by Yu. Suvaryan, "the culture of public administration in Armenia is in the process of development, and the Armenian administrative thought is quite extensive to be contained in a single publication" (p. 9). Special attention has been concentrated on the studies of historical developments of public administration institutions. Conceptual solution of the problem is realized through research of modern aspects of public administration in historical perspective. Aiming at the goal of complex studies of the process of development of the theory of public administration, its history in the Western world and ideological tendencies, continual attention is paid to the elucidation of the Armenian administrative thought and its details (from the 5th to the 20th centuries), stressing that "the accounts by the Armenian historians and religious and political thinkers, too, are full of episodes of state, community, and territorial administration, as well as comprehensive theorizations around different issues of public administration. These accounts include attempts at writing of the constitution – *Sahmanadrutyun Kanonakan* (Canonical Constitution) by Vachagan (the Pious) Barepasht¹ and *The Snare of Glory* by Hakob and Shahamir

¹ Vachagan Barepasht (the Pious) (484-the first half of the 6th century) was the Armenian King of the Kingdom of Artsakh and Utik (Eastern regions of Armenia).

Shahamiryan, legal theses valuable for state and public administration – *Kanonagirk Hayots* (the Armenian Book of Canons)...” (Yu. Suvaryan, p. 5).

According to B.L. Lawrence, “Studying the subject from its earliest phases in evolutionary continuity sharpens the vision of the present” [1, p. 307]. The authors of the book under review elaborated such a principle by conducting a comparative analysis of the theory and practice of public administration in the Western world with the historical developments of Armenian civic, political and administrative thought. It provides the opportunity of expanding the field of Armenian studies and advancing the research of public administration. The concept of public administration being a relatively new scientific category has different interpretations, the most prevailing among which “describes public administration as a complete system of state governance and local self-governance. Such a definition is, of course, not baseless; it is, however, incomplete”. Thus, one of the goals of the book is a theoretical substantiation of broader (than “state government”) meaning of public administration “attributed to an environment with strong civil society, whereby state government has developed and evolved into public administration” (Yu. Suvaryan, V. Mirzoyan, p. 10).

Different aspects of public administration are deeply rooted in history reflecting certain identity in the field of research and suggesting paths moving forward in study of its theoretical substantiation, as well as historical background. The book under review spans a considerable array of prominent proponents whose thoughts have contributed to the inception² and development of the theory of public

² The inception of the theory of public administration has been traced back by the authors applying the method of analysis of ideas relating to formation of its concept: “The ideal republic implies fair government by the best, the aristocracy” (Plato); “a hierarchy of state regimes based on ‘true’ and ‘pervert’ government... a state is a collection of citizens” (Aristotle’s thesis about the middle class is considered especially noteworthy in the light of contemporary public administration); “the state is rather to serve the establishment of order in the public life” (in the context of Thomas Hobbes’ conception the proponents of the theory of social contract describe the structure of the state); “every legitimate government is republican ... laws are only the conditions of civil association” (Jean-Jacque Rousseau was a convinced believer in the theory of social contract); “the idea of responsibility of the ruling elite towards the rest of the society” (according to John Locke, the subjects could question the authority of the monarch); “democratic governance (“spirit of true equality”) fails the very moment the concept of human equality is taken into its extreme” (Charles-Luis Montesquieu, as a proponent of the theory of social contract, emphasized the equality of men (“equal only as citizens”, who “become equal only with the help of the law”) and their freedom of action in the context of democratic governance); “government is an extremely profitable and, in certain circumstances, strictly necessary invention for the mankind” (David Hume’s two thoughts on public administration are underlined: the threat of extreme economic polarization of the society and the need for smooth and efficient implementation of the top-down reforms of the system of public administration); “political authority must be concentrated in one center, both for implementation of decisions by the government, and for the decisions themselves... the Sovereign power delegates everything possible to its subjects” (Hegel’s thoughts logically derive from his philosophy of right, and the second type of state (i.e. the attitude of the government towards the public’s participation in the decision-making process related to the government of the commonwealth) is in much favorable situation vis-à-vis the first type) (Yu. Suvaryan, V. Mirzoyan, pp. 14-22).

administration as a full-fledged discipline³ up until modern times⁴. "With the change in the management paradigm in the late 20th century, certain developments occurred in the theory of public administration", thus "the paradigm change in practice and theory featured prominently during the third phase of the development of public administration and led to the emergence of the "New Public Administration" (transition from bureaucratic administration to entrepreneurial organization⁵), oriented to the reforms in the executive branch of power, thus "New Public Administration" "can be especially efficient if adequately adopted by the main implementers of public administration" (Yu. Suvaryan, V. Mirzoyan, pp. 35-37).

The most important precondition for a legitimate democratic state, established local self-government and efficient public administration is considered to be civil society – the organized social groups and institutions, "its main functions include watching the activities of the state to ensure that it remains within its legal and constitutional limits, and taking all necessary measures to bring state officials back into their legislative boundaries". Coming out of the subject matter of public administration, as the complex of political, economic, and social relations that emerge during the provision of public services, Yu. Suvaryan notes that in any democratic country, the authorities and functions of the bodies of public administration are defined by the constitution and other legislature, as in the Republic of Armenia, for example, Article 2 and Article 7 of the Constitution provide the basis for the implementation of public administration (Yu. Suvaryan, pp. 40-42).

At the same time the authors aim at presenting the national and cultural features and the development of the theory and history of public administration in Armenia basing their research on the Armenian sources. Special attention is paid to the analysis of public administration within the framework of Armenian social and political thought of the period from the 5th to the 12th centuries, then the development of the theory of public administration in the 13th -18th centuries and the methodology and practice of public administration in the 19th -20th centuries.

It is necessary to mention that until the Middle Ages the Armenian statehood had already passed a long way of civilizational development⁶. According to David

³ Auguste Comte, Herber Spencer, Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, Vilfredo Pareto, Max Weber, Gabriel Tarde, Gustave Le Bon, Georg Simmel, Thorstein Veblen, Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Simon, Luther Gulick, Marshall Dimock.

⁴ Richard Stillman, Robert Denhardt, Michael LeMay, Leslie A. Pal, David Osborne, Ted Gaebler, Frank Goodnow.

⁵ "Public administrators comprise the bulk of government employment and activity... The principal activity of public administration is implementing laws, but there are also a range of other important activities carried on in these public organizations: for example, bureaucracies make policy, and in essence make law" [2, p. 2].

⁶ "An examination of the historical background of the ethno-political, social and cultural bases on which the traditional infrastructure of Armenian nationhood is built may help to classify theoretically the transitory characteristics in the developments of the political system of the Republic of Armenia

Marshall Lang, "The ancient land of Armenia is situated in the high mountains... Although Mesopotamia with its ancient civilizations of Sumer⁷ and Babylon, is usually considered along with Egypt as the main source of civilized life in the modern sense, Armenia too has a claim to rank as one of the cradles of the human culture. To begin with, Noah's Ark is mentioned in the Book of Genesis to have landed on the summit of Mount Ararat, in the very centre of Armenia.... Again, Armenia has a claim on our attention as one of the principal homes of ancient metallurgy, beginning at least five thousand years ago. Later on, Armenia became the first extensive kingdom to adopt Christianity as a state religion pioneering a style of Church architecture which anticipates our own Western Gothic" [6, p. 9].

In the book under review the inception of the Armenian management thought has been considered on the basis of the Armenian sources (the 5th century AD), particularly, Movses Khorenatsi's "History of Armenia". It is noted that Movses Khorenatsi mentioned "the organization of the kingdom" in the times of the Armenian King Vagharshak (the 2nd century AD). Further, there have been traced a number of features of public administration, such as territorial administration of the state, activities of the courts, the authorities of executive power, etc. V. Mirzoyan observes that "this type of organization, that is, the strict definition of the relations between the king and the landlord, was an important factor for ensuring stability in the kingdom". Attention has been paid to Pavstos Buzand's information about Ashtishat's (a village in Taron) *legislative council* (354 AD), which "introduced law and order, organized and transformed the behavior of the people of Armenia", and established a number of domestic rules and regulations, some of which were of universal nature. In relation to Vagharshak's prioritization of the ethical components of the relationship between the rulers and the subjects, the author notes that concerning the time of Arshak II (350-368) "such kind of public administration could not have been implemented or even proposed without the consent and partaking of the King". Considering Arshak's building of the city of Arshakavan from the viewpoint of public administration, he supposed that the landlords rather should have unified around the King and made him stronger for the sake of promoting an independent government policy. He notes that the King Pap's reforms – e.g. concerning people's freedom in expressing their will on personal matters, high degree of religious tolerance – also serve as an example of the background of today's "milder" concepts of public administration. Underlining, that Christianity was adopted and accepted by Armenians due to its spiritual, ethical, cultural, and educational values, and not because of coercion, the author

and elaborate a conception of historic-comparative approaches in order to understand how the Armenian society can react more efficiently and fundamentally to the rapid impact of modern democratic ideas" [3, p. 7].

⁷ W. Durant mentions Armenia as one of the countries from where the Sumerians (moving "through northern Mesopotamia down the Euphrates and the Tigris...") could arrive to Sumer [4, pp. 118-119; 5, p. 46].

concluded, that Byuzand told us about one of the exceptionally positive features of Armenian social-political thought, that is, tolerance towards the opinions of others, at the same time King Pap initiated radical reforms, strengthening the independence of the Armenian Church and the Armenian state in general. V. Mirzoyan noted that the principle of government (everybody, every link in the system, superior or subordinate, should be properly placed), being discussed since the times of Plato and Aristotle and receiving “the right person at the right place” formulation in the discipline of public administration, after the fall of the Armenian Arshakuni Kingdom (428 AD), according to Movses Khorenatsi’s conclusion in his “Lament”, had been breached. At the same time Khorenatsi has a remark on waiting for the emergence of a new Armenian King that will restore top-down order in the Armenian state by the example of self-regulation and strict division of the levels and spheres of government. Along with such a postulate, the author notes that the evaluation given by the 5th-century historians to the government of the kings of the 4th c. AD is vividly diversified. Particularly, the state activities of Trdat III [along with his role in the adoption of Christianity, as the state religion in Armenia (301 AD), first in the world] “had a significant input in restoring Armenia’s independent statehood, strengthening its government, and waging numerous victorious wars” (V. Mirzoyan, pp. 58-67, 69). Comparative analysis of the role of the king-church relations in Armenia, England and France in different periods of history brought the author to the following conclusion: “We, the Armenians, have been the first to introduce this new and important element (i.e. Christian religion) into the system of government. We could have provided the humanity with an efficient model of combining the secular and religious authorities and could have ourselves avoided a range of tragic events... We have to be grateful to our historians that have conveyed the behavior of our ancestors from the depth of centuries, not only to be proud of their great deeds, but also think over the opportunities lost and get lessons from past government practices for the present and for the future”. The author considers certain pieces of Ghazar Parpetsi’s theoretical heritage as the best parts of Armenian management thought, noting: “It includes a brilliant analysis on the use of authority, efficient coordination of the manager-worker relationship and other important matters” (V. Mirzoyan, pp. 75-76, 95)⁸.

⁸ The following sentence: “30 years after our defeat in the battle of Avarayr...” (V. Mirzoyan, p. 89) needs clarification, because, according to Eghishe, “... էթէ կողմ էր որ յաղթեաց, և կողմ էր որ պարսկեաց...” [7, էջ 240], “... neither side won, nor was defeated...” (i.e. there were neither winners, nor losers). In historical context, it was a victory against foreign aggression and despotism (the invading army of Sassanid Persia was three times more than the number of the Armenian forces) and against the Sassanids’ attempts to enforce renunciation of the Christian faith. “Unconscious death is death, conscious death is immortality” was the slogan of the *Sparapet* (Commander-in-Chief) of Armenia Vardan Mamikonyan and his fellow-fighters, who sacrificed their lives in the battle of Avarayr (451 AD) for the sake of freedom of the Fatherland and faith (they have been canonized by the Armenian Apostolic Church). The struggle continued and flamed during the Vahan

concluded, that Byuzand told us about one of the exceptionally positive features of Armenian social-political thought, that is, tolerance towards the opinions of others, at the same time King Pap initiated radical reforms, strengthening the independence of the Armenian Church and the Armenian state in general. V. Mirzoyan noted that the principle of government (everybody, every link in the system, superior or subordinate, should be properly placed), being discussed since the times of Plato and Aristotle and receiving “the right person at the right place” formulation in the discipline of public administration, after the fall of the Armenian Arshakuni Kingdom (428 AD), according to Movses Khorenatsi’s conclusion in his “Lament”, had been breached. At the same time Khorenatsi has a remark on waiting for the emergence of a new Armenian King that will restore top-down order in the Armenian state by the example of self-regulation and strict division of the levels and spheres of government. Along with such a postulate, the author notes that the evaluation given by the 5th-century historians to the government of the kings of the 4th c. AD is vividly diversified. Particularly, the state activities of Trdat III [along with his role in the adoption of Christianity, as the state religion in Armenia (301 AD), first in the world] “had a significant input in restoring Armenia’s independent statehood, strengthening its government, and waging numerous victorious wars” (V. Mirzoyan, pp. 58-67, 69). Comparative analysis of the role of the king-church relations in Armenia, England and France in different periods of history brought the author to the following conclusion: “We, the Armenians, have been the first to introduce this new and important element (i.e. Christian religion) into the system of government. We could have provided the humanity with an efficient model of combining the secular and religious authorities and could have ourselves avoided a range of tragic events... We have to be grateful to our historians that have conveyed the behavior of our ancestors from the depth of centuries, not only to be proud of their great deeds, but also think over the opportunities lost and get lessons from past government practices for the present and for the future”. The author considers certain pieces of Ghazar Parpetsi’s theoretical heritage as the best parts of Armenian management thought, noting: “It includes a brilliant analysis on the use of authority, efficient coordination of the manager-worker relationship and other important matters” (V. Mirzoyan, pp. 75-76, 95)⁸.

⁸ The following sentence: “30 years after our defeat in the battle of Avarayr...” (V. Mirzoyan, p. 89) needs clarification, because, according to Eghishe, “... եթէ կողմ էր որ յաղթեաց, և կողմ էր որ պարսկեաց...” [7, էջ 240], “... neither side won, nor was defeated...” (i.e. there were neither winners, nor losers). In historical context, it was a victory against foreign aggression and despotism (the invading army of Sassanid Persia was three times more than the number of the Armenian forces) and against the Sassanids’ attempts to enforce renunciation of the Christian faith. “Unconscious death is death, conscious death is immortality” was the slogan of the *Sparapet* (Commander-in-Chief) of Armenia Vardan Mamikonyan and his fellow-fighters, who sacrificed their lives in the battle of Avarayr (451 AD) for the sake of freedom of the Fatherland and faith (they have been canonized by the Armenian Apostolic Church). The struggle continued and flamed during the Vahan

the governance of Great Armenia and Cilician Armenia he concluded: "State governance in the ancient times was implemented based on certain, albeit non-complete, theoretical-methodological principles, which were reflected in the enacted legislation and government practices... The system of state governance in Cilician Armenia (a great principality in 1080-1198 and a kingdom in 1198-1375) was formed based on the above-mentioned principles and the experience of the European countries" (Yu. Suvaryan, pp. 103-104). He considers methodological principles of the Armenian thinkers of the 12th-18th centuries (Davit Alavka Son, Mkhitar Gosh, Nerses Shnorhali, Grigor Tatevatsi, Hakob and Shahamir Shahamiryan) as the sources of the development of the theory and practice of public administration (Yu. Suvaryan, pp. 110-114). Particularly, the problems of harmonic management of public life, according to Tatevatsi, and the system of public administration, according to Shahamiryan, are analyzed observing their ideas on the one hand, in line with the 21st century management paradigms and on the other hand, as containing ideas that have been discussed by prominent Western theorists 100-150 years later, being actual even nowadays (V. Mirzoyan, pp. 115-130, Yu. Suvaryan, pp. 131-137).

Studying Mikael Nalbandian's views on public administration and categorizing his ideas of liberty and civil society, matters of economic policy, nationality and government, Yu. Suvaryan underscores that "the aim of Nalbandyan's work, according to the author, 'is only to make the nation think about its future,' that is why, in his own words, there is a need for 'preaching the economic issue, preaching the human, preaching the nation...' as the main pillars for the establishment and development of statehood" (Yu. Suvaryan, pp. 157-167).

Touching the problem of the essence and issues of government according to the Catholicos of all Armenians Mkrtich Khrimyan, special attention has been paid to the regulation of the "authority-people" relationship¹³, the principles regulating the Armenian family life and self-made advancement in the processes of regulations and self-regulation. According to Khrimyan's concept, "the world

dynasty and its branches {the 3rd millennium BC - the kingdoms of Aratta ("the land of divine laws") and Arman(um/i); the 2nd millennium BC - the kingdoms of Hayasa, Isuwa (Tsopk) and Nairi; the 1st millennium BC - the Ararat (Urartu)-Van kingdom, the Ervanduni and Artashesyan kingdoms; the 1st millennium AD - the Armenian Arshakuni (65-428), the Armenian Kingdom of the Haikazun-Sisakyan-Aranshahik dynasty of Artsakh and Utik (484- the first half of the 6th century), the Armenian Kingdom of Bagratuni (885-1045) and its coeval and the subsequent (the 2nd millennium AD) ones (continuing in the 11th-14th cc.): Vaspurakan (908-1021), Kars-Vanand (963-1065), Siunik (987-1170), Tashir-Dzoraget (978-1113), Parisos (the second half of the 10th c.-1044), Kilikia (Principality - 1080-1198, Kingdom - 1198-1375)}, and also manifested by the ancient and medieval Armenian principalities (e.g. the Khorkhorunis, Bznunis, Manavazians, Mandakunis, Kamsarakans, Mamikonyans of Taron, Sasun and Taik, the Arstakh-Khachen principality, the Zakarians, the Arstakh Melikdoms et al.) [13, p. 83].

¹³ As it is interpreted: " 'Authority-people' can be translated into the modern scholarly language as the 'state-society' relationship, where the former, as the subject of government, and the latter, as the object of government, carry out mutually complementary functions" (V. Mirzoyan, p. 169).

cannot be governed without authority”, which derives from three sources; the will of God, the family and the natural inequality of the humans. This concept, which within the boundaries of the Armenian theoretical thought was elaborated by Mkhitar Gosh and Grigor Tatevatsi, is compared by V. Mirzoyan with *Thomas Aquinas*’ theoretical explanation of the origin of the state (pp. 169-170).

Considering the “Armenian National Constitution” from the viewpoint of the theory of public administration, it is noted that the great Armenian lawyer Grigor Zohrap (1861-1915) stated: “The constitution is the code of conduct inherent to the Armenian nation” (V. Mirzoyan, p. 139)¹⁴. Considering the question of regulation of the state-society relationship, according to Grigor Zohrap, the author shows that his central thesis is directly related to ensuring cooperation between state government bodies and civil society institutes (p. 192). It was merely a theoretical idea, because in conditions of the genocidal Ottoman despotism there was no mechanism of social regulation. V. Mirzoyan notes, “as incomers, the Turks, sooner or later, were going to try to get rid of the natives of the conquered land, and the “flirt” with the Armenians was merely an illusion for the eyes of the European community”, because “the government of Turkey had adopted policy that years later was going to become the main reason for a genocide” (pp. 139-143). In 1915 Grigor Zohrap became a victim of the Armenian genocide.

Analyzing Matevos Mamuryan’s views on the issues of ensuring legality in public life, V. Mirzoyan emphasizes several theoretical theses: (1) citizens unite and defeat the ‘public enmity’, (2) evaluation of the Armenian peculiarities of the state regulation of public life on the basis of the study of the history of Armenia, (3) distinguishing heads of the Armenian state (especially mentioning highly skillful in the state governance the Armenian kings Aram Haykazun, Tigran the Great), whose conduct, objectives, and public activities can serve as an example for all generations of Armenian managers, (4) the governor-subject harmony is one of the main principles of modern management, (5) if the adoption of foreign experience is done without the due consideration of the peculiarities of the Armenian environment, then the introduction of the most progressive laws, institutions, or concepts will not only be inefficient, but may even be harmful, (6) concept of public administration is based on complete trust towards the governability and prosperity of the country and the managerial responsibility of the authorities, managers, and intellectuals to exercise adequate economic, political, legal and cultural measures to make the property of the country a reality, (7) Mamuryan painfully wrote about political and social deprivation, and national discrimination of the Western Armenians in the Ottoman empire. The investigation of Mamuryan’s comprehensive views on the issues (which were out of the times of

¹⁴ It is noteworthy that the earliest mentioning of the Canonic Constitution (Կանոնական սահմանադրություն) in Armenia relates to the period of Nerses I the Great, Catholicos of Armenia [14, էջ 279].

inhumane and savage conditions of the Turkish genocidal state [15, pp. 24, 148]) of ensuring legality in public life brought the author to the following conclusion: "They are not only of historical significance, but can also be deployed for the efficient solution of the urgent problems of public administration in the 21st-century Armenia" (V. Mirzoyan, pp. 198-204, 211).

It is observed that Ghazaros Aghayan touches upon the importance of one of the most significant elements of the management of public cohabitation, the phenomenon of example, especially, referring to celebrities, expressing his creed of the leader, thus reviving Koghbatsi's idea on it (V. Mirzoyan, pp. 212-222).

The articles of Alexandr Myasnikyan ("Democratic Republic", 1907) and Simon Zavaryan ("Decentralization", 1908) have been analyzed by Yu. Suvaryan from the point of view of the theoretical-methodological issues related to various components of the system of public administration. According to A. Myasnikyan, the concept of a democratic republic is tantamount to a real democratic state, and elections are a very important way of forming governmental bodies. S. Zavaryan viewed, on the one hand, "government centralization as a reason for the destruction of very big countries" and, on the other hand, democracy as the rule of the people, because democratic governance can happen when a maximum number of people participate in law-making and regulation of public affairs (Yu. Suvaryan, pp. 226-228).

V. Mirzoyan defining the essence of public administration as cooperation between state and civil society institutions considers some views of Garegin Nzhdeh as a background of the theoretical analysis of the internal reasons of the crisis and collapse of the state governance system. The topics of such an investigation are based on Nzhdeh's experience in military and state-political activities since November 1919 (in short period of time he managed to liberate the Syunik region from Turkish invaders) and, particularly, in the period of the sovereign Syunik's existence (established on December 25, 1920), which was named *Lernahayastan - Mountainous Armenia* (on April 26, 1921). The author notes that Garegin Nzhdeh repeatedly answered the question "why did Mountainous Armenia fight?" and "why did it lose?" and "among other reasons... Nzhdeh underlined a number of management-related mistakes": the division of state authority as a result of the merger of the two governments of Mountainous Armenia, the loss of legitimacy of the state authority there, the illegal change in Nzhdeh's status, the artificial growth of the state government apparatus, the unjustified changes in tax collections, the inefficiency among the higher instances of the government, etc... The following thought of Garegin Nzhdeh (from his "Notes from the jail") can be taken as an example of a motto of a prosperous state: "The amicable position of an individual citizen and his attitude towards the state is what determines the fate of the state". Highly assessing Nzhdeh's contribution to the cause of defense and preservation of Syunik ("The broad activities of the Armenian military commander and political figure were to serve that very concept. Garegin

Nzhdeh's greatest service to his nation and his state was the existence of the state of Mountainous Armenia... It was impossible to do more in such a situation. Nevertheless, it was owing to Nzhdeh's titanic efforts that Mountainous Armenia fulfilled its historical mission, that is, by preserving its independence, allowed the government of Soviet Armenia to retain Syunik in its territory", his following words are cited in the book under review: "There cannot exist a united and independent Armenia without Great Syunik. If we ignore this truth, we will lose everything". Nzhdeh's thought ("In such historic times, the criteria of manager and his query should be the following: what dictates the eternal interests of my country and my nation? And not just daily government") is considered as a desirable code of conduct for all levels of management (V. Mirzoyan, pp. 228-238, 240).

Yu. Suvaryan presenting the systems of public administration at the times of the First, the Second and the Third Republics, notes that 543 years after the fall of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia (1375), on May 28, 1918 the Armenian statehood was restored and a contemporary parliamentary republic, with its legislative, executive and judicial branches was created and called the First Republic, which existed as an independent state for two and a half years. During that short period of time the government passed three stages of activities: state-organizational, political-creative and a struggle against internal and external enemies. The judicial power was established and the fourth power - the press - was developed in the Republic of Armenia. An important manifestation of public administration was the government-adopted program concerning the development of regional and city self-government. On the basis of main social and economic principles of the First Republic's government the author concludes: "Economic policy was based on the ideology of market economy and private property" (Yu. Suvaryan, pp. 241-243). Unlike the First Republic, the Second Republic - the Armenian SSR, having some attributes of the parliamentary republic, was not an independent state comprising part of the USSR, and as a result of it "the functions of state government bodies were limited, they mainly implemented decisions adopted by the Soviet government bodies and carried out the Soviet-adopted economic and social policies on the territory of the Armenian SSR" (Yu. Suvaryan, pp. 244-245). Political system had direct impact on the country's economy, because the dominant ideology of the USSR, the Marxist-Leninist Communist Doctrine "was at the same time the methodological basis of the state governance". Thus the system of governance was strictly centralized and ideologized, consequently "the Armenian SSR replicated the main laws of the RSFSR and, later on, the USSR, adopted three constitutions (1922, amended in 1925, 1937 and 1978). The economic model (based on the efficient state ownership of the means of production) managed by governance full of administrative methods (which mandated both the strictly limited private proprietorship and the lack of competition) was doomed to "be replaced by another, more advanced, political and economic system and its relevant state governance mechanism, which is exactly

what happened in 1991, when the process of restoration of the Armenian statehood was finalized by the 21 September independence referendum. The Republic of Armenia by the Constitution adopted by the 5 July 1995 referendum was declared “a sovereign, democratic, social state governed by the rule of law”, with a semi-presidential government system. The analysis of the government system of the RA (President, National Assembly, Government, Territorial Administration, Head of the Community) brought Yu. Suvarian to the following conclusion: “In general, although the system of public administration and local self-government in Armenia mostly corresponds to the democratic and legal criteria of the civilized world, as an ever-evolving phenomenon, it is subject to reform and improvement, so as to make it more democratic and upgrade its political, economic, and social efficiency”. (pp. 241-258). At the same time special attention is paid to participatory governance in local self-government systems of Armenia (R. Hayrapetyan, pp. 48-55, 249 -269).

The final chapter of the book under review is devoted to language and speech in the system of public administration, considering language as public reality {“Armenian national identity has been preserved both by language and religion (Armenianized)¹⁵... In the case of unregulated language policy, the whole system of public administration becomes vulnerable, while the statehood becomes unstable... ”} and rhetoric as a tool of public administration (“The administrative and economic levers of regulating people’s joint activities, will, no doubt, always retain their significance, but they become much more efficient in combination with the deployment of the social-psychological levers of management, especially persuasive speech”) (V. Mirzoyan, p. 289, 300).

The scholarly work of Yu. Suvarian, V. Mirzoyan, R. Hayrapetyan, developing an analytic survey of earlier discussions with new methodological approaches, is a comprehensive and valuable contribution to the field of research of evolution of the Armenian management thought (from the ancient times up until the 20th century) within the historical context and the theory of public administration.

¹⁵ Preservation of the Armenian national values is determined by the territorial, cultural, spiritual and hereditary integrity of the Fatherland – Eastern Armenia (the Republic of Armenia, the Artsakh Republic, Javakhk, Nakhijevan, Utik, Paytakaran, etc.), Western Armenia and Cilician Armenia.

References:

1. Lawrence B.L., Historical Perspective: Using the Past to Study the Present. – The Academy of Management Review, vol. 9, No 2, 1984.
2. Handbook of Public Administration, edited by B. Guy Peters and Jon Pierre, London, 2007.
3. Danielyan E. L., The Fundamental Questions of Armenian History in the Light of Tendencies of Modern Democracy. – Armenian Philosophical Academy, Armenian Mind, vol. V, No 1-2, 2001.
4. Will Durant. The Study of Civilization. Part I, Our Oriental Heritage, New York, 1954.
5. Danielyan E. L., Armenian civilizational heritage versus Turkish-Azerbaijani falsification of history and historical geography. – «Լրաբեր» հաս. գիտությունների, N 1, 2014:
6. David M. Lang, Armenia: Cradle of Civilization, London, 1970.
7. Եղիշե, Վասն Վարդանայ եւ Հայոց պատերազմին, Երևան, 1989:
8. J. Friedrich, Der Vertrag des Šuppiluliumaš mit ḫukkanaš und den Leuten von ḫajaša. – Staatsverträge des ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, 2 Teil, Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft, 34 Band, 1 Heft, 1930.
9. Danielyan E.L., The Historical background to Armenian state political doctrine. – Armenian perspectives, London, 1997.
10. Bryce T., The Kingdom of the Hittites, Oxford University Press, 1999.
11. Ղազարյան Ռ., Հայաստ. քաղաքական և մշակութային պատմություն, Երևան, 2009:
12. Պողոսեան Յ.Պ., Ներածություն հայ հոգեբանության, Գահիրե, 1958:
13. Danielyan E. L., Importance of the Armenian Toponyms' Ontological Integrity in the System of National Security. – «21st CENTURY», № 2 (14), 2013.
14. Սովսէս Խորենացի, Պատմութիւն Հայոց, Երևան, 1991:
15. Safrastyan R., Ottoman Empire: the genesis of the program of genocide (1876-1920), Yerevan, 2011.