

## **MODERN MANAGEMENT AS THE ANCIENT ART AND THE LATEST SCIENCE**

*Karimov D.S.,*

*Senior Lecturer, Department of Military Art,*

*Academy of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Uzbekistan*

**Annotation:** This article provides a brief analysis of the emergence, development, and improvement of management, including troop management. It demonstrates the dependence of troop management development on the advancement of technical management tools and the composition of troops. The article presents ways to improve the troop management system as human society evolves, troop composition changes, and technical means of troop management advance.

**Keywords:** management science, management theory and art, management bodies, troops.

As soon as humans populated the Earth and began living in tribes, the need for the science and art of management emerged. It is evident that to maintain order within a community, the initial need was to manage the tribe's people, the tribe itself, and particularly the group tasked with protecting the tribe from wild animals and other tribes attempting to seize fertile lands. Collective labor (hunting, fishing, food preparation and distribution, shelter construction, clothing production, and crafting tools and weapons), as well as protection from enemies and wild animals, spurred the emergence of economic and military management. At this stage of societal development, it became necessary to distribute responsibilities among tribe members for these tasks, leading to the emergence of individuals capable of assigning these duties. Formidable, inexplicable natural phenomena and the astonishing perfection and beauty of the surrounding world awakened religious-mystical, moral, and aesthetic needs in people. Centuries would pass, but management in human societal life would remain relevant.

From earlier periods of human activity, only fragmented and scattered information has reached us, containing analyses and generalizations of management experience. Documents from the Sumerian civilization, which existed over 5,000 years ago—one of the oldest written records—show that ancient managers clearly understood the importance of administrative management elements such as inventory, fact registration, organizational reporting, and control. The grandiose structures of the ancient world continue to astonish not only with their scale and the scope of construction work but also with the organizational talent of ancient builders: managing a workforce of 100,000 over decades remains a complex task for management specialists even today, with modern technology and management advancements. The Egyptians widely applied planning and control over production programs.

Around 4,000 years ago, the treatise *The Instruction of Ptahhotep* (Ancient Egypt, 2000–1500 BCE) was written on methods and styles of managing groups. Ptahhotep, a great expert in the art of management, advised: **“If you are a leader, remain calm when listening to a petitioner’s words: do not push him away before he unburdens his soul with what he wished to tell you. A person struck by misfortune wants to pour out their soul even more than to achieve a favorable resolution to their issue.”**

Over time, management processes became more organized and distinct, involving larger groups of people performing specialized functions in managing the state, army, and more. Today, management is described as both the most ancient art and the newest science.

Prominent scholars and practitioners (H. Koontz, C. O'Donnell, and others) argued that management is primarily an art: *"The management process is an art, the essence of which lies in applying science (the foundations of organized knowledge in management) to the realities of any situation."*

On the role of science in management, they stated: *"Although management is an art, those engaged in it will achieve better results if they understand and apply the underlying science. When the importance of effectiveness and efficiency in group collaboration is recognized in any society, it can be confidently stated that management is the most important of all arts."*

The renowned German military theorist Carl von Clausewitz, in his book *On War*, insightfully discussed the interpenetration of science and art. He argued that the goal of science is knowledge, while the goal of art is skill: *"Where creativity and creation are the aim, art reigns; science prevails where investigation and knowledge are the goal."*

It should be noted that as armies grew in size, new means of armed struggle emerged, and technical management tools developed, management processes became more organized and specialized, involving larger groups performing specific state and troop management functions.

Various historical sources mention the emergence of the headquarters as a commander's management body differently, but the earliest reference to a headquarters as a management organ dates back to the era of Alexander the Great. In slave-owning and feudal societies, the presence of specific individuals serving as couriers—mechanical transmitters of the commander's will—did not fully assist the commander in managing troops. As means and methods of armed struggle developed, and the size and quality of troops increased, the need arose for a specialized management body to assist the commander. In the Russian army, such a management body, called the headquarters, was first established under the army's commander-in-chief in the early 18th century.

By the early 19th century, with the creation of permanent infantry divisions and corps, their management bodies were reorganized. At that time, the army headquarters encompassed the entire field management, including all chiefs directly subordinate to the commander. For the first time, the position of chief of staff emerged, overseeing the quartermaster service (operational leadership) and the service of duty generals and officers. The chief of staff was responsible for these services' operations, but their role, as well as that of the headquarters in management, was still minor. This is evidenced by Napoleon's chief of staff, Marshal Berthier, who wrote to Marshal Soult that he himself represented little in the army, merely receiving reports addressed to the emperor from generals and marshals and endorsing their orders.

An analysis of the historical development of army, corps, division, and unit headquarters reveals common trends in improving management—a complex process of influencing management bodies and groups to achieve set goals. The primary trend is that changes in the organizational structure, content, and methods of headquarters' work, as the commander's management body, are directly dependent on changes in the means of armed struggle, the size and organization of troops, methods of conducting combat operations, and technical management tools.

In modern conditions, the continuous improvement of armed struggle means, changes in troop organizational structure, and the nature and methods of conducting combat operations have led

to fundamental changes in troop management. The volume of management tasks has sharply increased, while the time available to complete them has significantly decreased. Consequently, the role of both commanders and general staff in troop management has grown substantially, as one of the headquarters' functions is to coordinate the actions of all management bodies aimed at solving tasks set by the commander, regardless of the evolving situation, preparation, or conduct of operations (battles).

Management as a science has its own subject of study, specific problems, and approaches to solving them. The scientific foundation of this discipline comprises the entire body of knowledge about management in the form of concepts, theories, principles, methods, and management techniques. Management science is a coherent system of interconnected categories and concepts, such as management, management system, management organization, management process, managerial activity, management goals, tasks, functions, methods, and the essence and content of management.

In modern conditions, the state and development of management are rightly considered one of the most important indicators of the armed forces' combat power and readiness, as well as their organizational and technical perfection. The primary goal of management is to ensure the maximum effectiveness of subordinate troops in solving tasks during operations (battles).

One of the laws of military management (the law of dependence of organizational forms and management methods on the armed forces' structure, material-technical base, and management conditions) states that the course and outcome of a war (combat operations) depend on the balance of economic, moral-psychological, scientific-technical, and military potentials of the warring parties. However, the actual balance of forces during combat operations is determined not so much by potential as by realized combat capabilities, and the degree of realization of these capabilities directly depends on the effectiveness of management.

To achieve victory in battle or operations, it is not enough to be generally stronger. It is necessary to create superiority in forces and means in zones of active combat operations—where and when the sides inflict the greatest losses on each other. The ability to concentrate efforts on key directions (sectors) also depends on the art of managing available forces and means. History provides numerous examples where skilled commanders achieved victory with equal or even fewer forces, while commanders lacking the “science of victory” suffered defeat despite overall superiority. For instance, Alexander the Great, with an army of 300,000, defeated the much larger Persian army under Darius III. Similarly, Babur, with only 12,000 warriors, defeated the 100,000-strong army of Delhi Sultan Ibrahim Lodi by leveraging terrain, despite the enemy's numerical superiority.

Troop management evolved with the emergence of new weaponry, changes in troop organizational structure, increased combat capabilities, and the growing complexity of conditions for preparing and conducting combat operations. The introduction of artillery necessitated the creation of management bodies and specialists capable of managing it. The emergence of aviation, missile forces, and air defense forces similarly required specialized management bodies and personnel.

The overarching goal of military management is to ensure the maximum effectiveness of available forces and means to accomplish tasks and achieve victory over the enemy with minimal losses. In modern conditions, with rapidly advancing technologies and new means of armed struggle, the issue of improving management effectiveness is more critical than ever. The

paths to achieving this are diverse: **improving the organizational structure of management systems, developing and implementing highly effective technical management tools, enhancing organizational forms and methods of headquarters' work, and improving the training of management personnel.**

Let us consider some of these approaches:

Improving the organizational and staffing structure (OShS) of management systems directly depends on the principle of aligning the structure and size of the managing body with the managed object. The structure of created (or reformed) management bodies must correspond to the composition of subordinate troops, and their size must match the volume of management tasks, the system of command posts, and the number of combat crews. This improvement enables timely control over the preparation of subordinate management bodies and troops for upcoming actions, rapid receipt of information about the evolving situation, status, position, and staffing of personnel, equipment, and weaponry, thereby allowing the determination and assignment of tasks for specific activities.

The development and implementation of highly effective technical management tools, such as automated troop control systems (ASUV) and their software, as well as information and communication technologies, significantly reduce the time required to perform management tasks, thereby enhancing management effectiveness and achieving the goal of defeating the opposing enemy.

Currently, as in ancient times, defining management tasks requires answering the question of what the management body must do and in what sequence to achieve the management goal. Any system comprises numerous interconnected elements forming a cohesive whole, a principle fully applicable to military management systems.

The organizational structure plays a significant role in improving management. Creating an organizational management structure is a critical component of the broader management function of organization. There is a close connection between the organizational structure and the management structure: the organizational structure reflects the division of tasks among structural units, groups, and individual operators, while the management structure creates coordination mechanisms to ensure the effective achievement of common goals and tasks.

Changes in the combat and numerical composition, nature of troop actions, and the state of management tools typically necessitate objectively required adjustments to the management system's structure. The organizational structure is the structure of the management system and its subsystems (the object and subject of management), reflecting the organizational relationships between their elements. Its characteristics are determined by the nature, diversity, and complexity of managed processes, the depth of division of managerial labor, the degree of specialization, the scale of managerial activity, and its specificity.

The foundation of the organizational structure is a set of distinct but closely interconnected elements (structural units) and activities aimed at achieving common management goals. From ancient times to the present, achieving societal goals in organizing and sustaining society, as well as in military affairs, has required managing groups of people and troop compositions.

In modern conditions, driven by scientific-technical progress, continuous improvements in weapons, combat, and specialized equipment, and significant changes in the methods and forms of conducting operations (battles), the complexity and number of connections between

management bodies are increasing, placing ever-higher demands on troop management. Fully meeting these modern requirements is a particularly pressing issue today.

Therefore, improving troop management must be an ongoing process, as there is no limit to scientific-technical progress, the enhancement of weaponry and equipment capabilities, or the development of troop (force) groupings. The task of aligning management with ever-increasing demands will always remain relevant, as outdated management begins to constrain the combat capabilities of troops, forces, and means, rather than enabling the effective use of their potential in modern military conflicts.

**References:**

1. *Uzbekistan National Encyclopedia*. – UzME 2 “Beshik-Gidrofizika,” DIN. Tashkent: 2001, pp. 85–86.
2. Altukhov P.K. *Fundamentals of Troop Management Theory*. – VI, Moscow: 1984, pp. 3–4, 10–16, 67–74.
3. Chandler D.G. *The Campaigns of Napoleon*. New York, 1966. Russian edition: Chandler D. *Napoleon’s Military Campaigns. Triumph and Tragedy of the Conqueror*. Moscow, 1999.
4. “Traditional War Has Become a Rarity” – <http://www.rol.ru/news/misc/newsreg>