Alexander Čemez

Political Leader as Participant in the Public Sector in the Context of Social Security

2015

MUZEUM HISTORII POLSKI

Political Leader as Participant in the Public Sector in the Context of Social Security

PhDr. Alexander Čemez, Ph.D.
Institute of Communication, SLOVAKIA

ABSTRACT

The present contribution deals with the issue of political leader as public participant in the context of social security. It is divided into three parts. In the first part author deals with the participants of public policy. The second part analyzes the political leader as a public participant, and a third part focuses on social security.

ARTICLE INFO

1. Public sector and its participants

From the aspect of examining public policy as a scientific discipline, in my opinion, the participants of public policy can be term as its key concept because it is contained in each of the relevant part of public policy. Decisive role is played by participants of public policy also in defining individual and social genesis of public interests, as well as defining the relationship between public policy and the public interest, political sciences, econom-

ics, law, sociology or public administration. Participants of public policy can be divided, under the public choice theory, into two major groups:[1]

1. Voters.
2. Elected members, or rather politicians and civil servants.

Arnošt Veselý states these potential participants in the public sector:[2]

1. Ministers and their advisors.
2. Ministries and their officials.
3. Legislators.
4. Courts.
5. Political parties.
6. Army.
7. Autonomous non-governmental organizations.
8. International and supranational institutions.

According to M. Potůčka there are those participants of public policy:[3]

1. Initiators of policy.
2. Policy makers (conceptors).
3. Policy implementers.
4. Policy addressees, so called indifferent.

If accentuate the option of two different attitudes of participants towards the policy itself, then we can put these two categories:[4]

1. The first approach is based on aspect of monitoring the process of policy authorization so that public policy has been so called authorized operation within the meaning of the political process and political activity summary of problems of public interest.
2. The second approach deals with structuring interactions between participants, based on the existence of so-called collectivized decisions, the participants which are just individuals, as well as a groups of diverse entities that have an interest in reaching a certain common goal. Such decision has subsequently resulted in all members of the entity (state or more precisely political organizations) in which such decision takes place. The quality of collective decision-making is yet largely proportional to the quality of relations between the participating parties.

---

[1] M. Klus, M. Adamcová, *Verejná politika*, Banská Bystrica 2006.

[2] A. Veselý, *Vymedzení a strukturace problému ve veřejné politice*, Praha 2009.

[3] M. Klus, M. Adamcová, *Verejná politika*…

[4] Ľ. Malíková, *Verejná politika: aktéri a procesy*, Banský Bystrica 2003.

Another way to structure the participants of public policy is:[5]
1. Political parties – which have a dominant character in mediating political values within society; as well they have a very important distributive function, because from them members of the most important participant of public policy – state executive – are appointed.
2. The national executive is based on another important group that is the state apparatus, and its role are the technical and organizational preparations for the implementation of public policy that is prepared by central executive; within the state apparatus, it is essential to distinguish between the nominate members, and so called state employees who may have at different levels of state apparatus completely different functions and characters.
3. Special group Policy makers also form coalitions of participants that are called third sector and under this term they enter to the individual sequences of decision-making process within the public policy, different kinds of NGOs or so called think tanks.

Citizens themselves may be located on a scale on the poles between complete indifference and direct participation in implementation. However, the character of their individual behavior, in final consequence in deciding extent determine the collective participants of public policy, because they form the basic incentives for such behavior. These incentives are usually based on different models of implementation of public policies in a given entity. In general, we distinguish four such models:[6]
1. **Authoritative model** – this model is typical for poorly functioning democratic regimes, or more precisely for also political systems that just pass off as democracies. For this characteristic is using of planning, directive management, hierarchy and responsibility or control, as key instruments of implementation. In these days, there are various political systems which, although are officially considered as democracies, but in fact apart from attribute of the elections, head towards to authoritarian model, that in many aspects is becoming incompatible with the very definition of public policy and its public character.

[5] M. Klus, M. Adamcová, *Verejná politika*…
[6] M. Klus, G. Mezeiová, D. Mydliarová, *Aktéri verjnej politiky*, [in:] *Teória a prax verejnej politiky*, F. Briška (ed.), Banská Bystrica 2010.

2. **The participatory model** – a participating model is characteristic mainly for democracies, which are determined by plural voting system and a strong civil society. The main feature of a participatory model in implementing public policy is accentuating mainly indirect management tools, spontaneity, learning, adaptation, negotiation, cooperation and trust as appropriate tools for implementation. It is characteristic for the USA, Australia, Canada, where in addition meets one of the other attributes of the model, which is the existence of so-called political nation.

3. **Coalition of participants model** – is mainly based on the assumption of plurality of participants who participate in the implementation of the policy and to communicate with each other, to compromise, negotiate and more or less at the same time share a certain set of social values and promote the common objectives. It is especially typical for democracies with heterogeneous structure of the society, largely is determined by the proportional voting system, and so on is typical for example for most countries of continental Europe.

4. **Never-ending process model** – this model has a specific position. It does not accentuate the specificity of the society or regime in which the policy is implemented, but the fact that implementers of policies in an effort to arrive at an optimal solution gradually optimize the structure of objectives and set of implemented techniques. By this implementation participants are approaching to the definition of policy makers – those who through participation in the implementation of public policies continuously acquire certain skills and abilities to plan, promote programs and negotiate with the other participating parties in the process. These capabilities ultimately appear unavoidable for the expected efficient realization of such activities.

2. Political leader as public participant

Under the term "leader" we can also understand such participants of public policy, who has the ability to lead and manage others. From this point of view, his tasks and place in society, political leaders are divided as follows:[7]

1. **Political leader** indicates such activity consisting in initiating, leading and managing in achieving common objectives in the area of

---

[7] A. Čemez, *Politické líderstvo v kontexte sociálneho zabezpečenia*, [in:] *Systém sociálneho zabezpečenia vo vybraných krajinách EÚ*, O. Bočáková, A. Rehuš (ed.), Brno 2014.

policy. Political leadership is carried out by one or more persons that manage supporters. Leadership differentiate from the powers, whose followers are subordinates to it or from demagogy, which affects the conditions in which individuals cease to be an active subjects. In the case of real political leadership, there is a relationship between the leader and his rational followers and not between the leader and their subordinates.

2. **Symbolic political leader** – its mandate to govern public affairs is received only by historical or political chance, for example as symbolic political leader of monarchist political system and partly by his powers or mainly from the aspect of his strong personality as political leader.

3. **Charismatic political leader** – often he is also a radical, which destroys the old order and establishes a new one. Rule over people due to unusual qualities that are unavailable to others, people subordinate to him because they believe in phenomena that prove his unusual qualities. People make concession in the legal standards and subordinate to the new order of proclaimed leader. Charisma, which can be considered as highly appreciated feature of a political leader is something unstable and ephemeral and to certain extent irrational and problematically analyzable because the charismatic leader is one who is able to change the course of events and tendencies in political processes.

4. **Dictatorial political leader** – a charismatic leadership is reflected in its pure form only at the beginning of the reign, later is transformed into dictatorship or government without the charisma that initial charismatic leader had lost.

Regarding to the typology of leaders, you can choose a different approach, based on the facts of the Slovak Republic and as a research sample Slovak prime ministers are used:[8]

1. **Dominant leader** – reflected by the relatively high extent of personal dominance, dominant position in his own political entity or even in the whole governmental coalition (V. Mečiar, R. Fico).

2. **Negotiator** – has a weaker position, which may be related to the high number of coalition partners, or subjects in his own political entity (i.e. M. Dzurinda).

---

[8] A. Čemez, *Teoretické aspekty politického líderstva*, [in:] *Interpolis 2012*, A. Kollár, P. Bolfová, Tichá, K. (ed.), Banská Bystrica 2012.

3. **The temporary leader** – leading position for example in the position of Prime Minister holds a relatively short time, because does not have sufficiently strong position to keep it (i.e. M. Čič, J. Čarnogurský, J. Moravčík, I. Radičová).

In terms of the political agenda and its promotion and the specific capabilities that are associated with it, it is possible to distinguish political leaders as follows:[9]

1. **Ideological leader** – his task is to prepare the program of a political subject. Creativity is expected from him, which is heading towards the creating new ideas. He needs creates potential, as well as a great amount of knowledge in order from them could be a new quality or some added value.

2. **The communication leader** – his role is to promote a political program, as well as flexible adaptation to different audiences in terms of the preferred way of communication.

Political leadership meet the following functions[10]:

1. **Formal and administrative space**:
a) administrative function which consists of control and coordination,
b) strategic function, which is based on the ability of the leader to formulate long-term goals, plans, forecasts and choices of effective methods of solving it,
c) expert-consultative function, which emphasizes the competent entering into the management process or the ability of leader to currently correct a predetermined course.

2. **Block functions, which apply to the emotional leadership**:
a) psychotherapeutic function – overcoming misunderstandings and conflicts in human relations and in the broader sense – the art to manage the situations,
b) the ability to project a negative images outside the internal system – defense and consolidating of group identity through maintaining a dual structure "us – them",
c) quality control of entering and exiting emotions with the intention to create an conformist psychological climate.

3. **The dimension of leadership, which includes special (integrated) functions** – the leader as a bearer of standards, traditions and codes

---

[9] A. Čemez, *Líder* v *kontexte politického marketingu*, [in:] *Quo vadis massmedia / Quo vadis marketing*, D. Petranová, R. Nováková, H., Pravdová H. (ed.), Trnava 2011.

[10] P. Kulašík, *Politológia*, Hlohovec 2005.

and patterns of behavior, collective values and ultimately projects heading towards the future.

3. Social security as a result of social policy

Social policy as a term appeared at the crossroads between the 19th and 20th centuries. There are many definitions of social policy[11] which is based on the meaning of "social". "Social policy" would therefore be, in its contents, a policy relatively wide diapason of other policies, for example housing policy, health or education policy, because[12] issues of the relationship that enter the social character of the state is the broadly outlined theme and can accede to it from different angles[13].

Nevertheless, in Slovakia more often we meet the narrow understanding of social policy, therefore, only as a part of public policy that deals primarily with how the society should help or to "take care" of people who are exposed to consequences of a disadvantaged or market failure or families[14].

In the current Europe, the implementation of social policy concentrates on the social integration of people. It creates and develops the system of social institutions that reached a certain level of implementation of constitutional rights of citizens to live in dignity. The reached state was gradually called social security[15].

Social Security system firstly secured industrial workers in the period after an accident at work, in case of illness, disability and loss of breadwinner of family in times of O. von Bismarck in the 80s of the 19th century[16]. The concept of social security has not been in the literature successfully defined. Empirically, however, it defines an agreement on social security. More generally, it refers to a condition where the citizen is not faced with an existential danger of liquidation. It is a static concept that describes a state of social security at the time. Equivalents in foreign languages are:[17]

---

[11] I. Tomeš, *Úvod do teorie a metodologie sociální politiky*, Praha 2010.

[12] M. Beblavý, *Sociálna politika: vysokoškolská učebnica*, Prešov 2009.

[13] O. Bočáková, *Integračné tendencie v EÚ a sociálna politika Slovenskej republiky*, [in:] *Slováci ako euroobčania v Európskom dome: analýza možností ďalšieho rozvoja životnej úrovne občanov SR*, O. Bočáková (ed.), Trnava 2014.

[14] M. Beblavý, *Sociálna politika*….

[15] I. Tomeš, Úvod do teorie…

[16] I. Tomeš, *Obory sociální politiky*, Praha 2011.

[17] I. Tomeš, Úvod do teorie…

1. France – securité sociale.
2. Spanish – seguridad sociale.
3. German – Sozialsicherheit.
4. Czech – sociální bezpečnost.

For the first time the term "seguridad social" we find in connection with the reform efforts of Simon Bolivar in 1826. The concept of social security was for first time officially used in the United States for the designation of the Federal Pension Insurance Act of 1935. The term was also used in the European Charter of Social Security of 1961. Currently, the concept of social security equate with the content of the above mentioned agreement. According to her, social security system covers public benefits, to which a citizen is entitled by law in the case of:[18]

1. Health care.
2. Sickness.
3. Unemployment.
4. Old age.
5. Accidents at work and occupational diseases.
6. Family support.
7. Maternity.
8. Invalidity.
9. Loss of breadwinner.

The current rapidly changing society often presents its considerable dynamism and continuous progress. In many cases, however, there set in unexpected situations that significantly determine not only the lives of individuals living in society, but also society as complex. This negative situations can be called social events or social risks, as they are closely linked to relevant changes in the then lifestyle the affected individuals[19]. In this context, often in the society sound voices that call for the elimination of social risks or require government setting such rules in the field of social security, which in the case of social risk are offering a helping hand from the state. Social security systems therefore seem as an important instrument of social policy of the state, which include a wide range of institutions and the measures through which the state has interest in preventing or mitigating social risks in modern society[20].

---

[18] Ibidem.

[19] A. Čemez, T. Habánik, *Sociálna bezpečnosť jedinca v kontexte sociálneho štátu*, [in:] *Sociálne zdravie jedinca a spoločnosti*, A. Kozoň (ed.), Sládkovičovo 2014.

[20] T. Habánik, *Princípy sociálnej ochrany na Slovensku*, [in:] O. Bočáková, K. Janas (ed.), *Aktuálne otázky politiky III*, Trenčín, 2014.

Especially in times of general insecurity, charismatic leaders often appear. As an example can serve the period after 1989, when this type of leaders appeared in Central and Eastern Europe. In a surroundings of Central Europe that were V. Mečiar in Slovakian part of the federation, V. Klaus, or more precisely V. Havel in the Czech part of the federation, L. Walesa in Poland or J. Antall in Hungary. Especially in countries of the former Soviet Union charismatic political leaders have emerged in the form of charlatans and leaders of various cults, regional, religious, ethnic and other groups. For all the examples, we set Kašpirovský that even "sent" positive energy over the phone. The period of transformation process can be considered a suitable breeding ground for the charismatic leaders of a different kind by reason of that during the transformation occurs a period of general uncertainty, when the old social norms no longer apply and new social norms have not been applied yet. There is a sort of interlude[21].

As it has emerged from the above, in critical moments uncertainty, confusion, chaos occurs or a state of anomie, as it is called by Jürgen Habermas. Examples are the transformation processes, due to which there might be transformation of the entire political, economic and social system. The original system no longer works and on its ruins, a new system is established that is not working yet. There is a certain vacuum, a kind of intermediate time, which is a good breeding ground for charismatic leaders. Probably an individual with greatest charism, or in conjunction with other attributes, will become leader. Ordinary person during transformation loses orientation in his environment, as well as basic pillars of its own being, and therefore takes refuge and seeks certainty. This certainty may be just the charismatic leader. Personality coming in this period derives its legitimacy from charisma while institutionalized situations (the one that was here and the one yet to come) from legal-rational legitimacy. Charisma thus can evince only in a particular situation. It is sleeping and waiting for his moment when he wakes up to the activity. Such a personality could be even above the law because it enjoys extremely high social trust[22].

---

[21] A. Čemez, *Politické líderstvo…*

[22] A. Čemez, Úvod do politického marketingu, [in:] *Médiá v čase krízy*, J. Matúš, J. Kolláriková (ed.), Trnava 2010.

References:

1. Beblavý M., *Sociálna politika: vysokoškolská učebnica*, Prešov 2009.
2. Bočáková O., *Integračné tendencie v EÚ a sociálna politika Slovenskej republiky*, [in:] *Slováci ako euroobčania v Európskom dome: analýza možností ďalšieho rozvoja životnej úrovne občanov SR*, O. Bočáková, (ed.), Trnava 2014.
3. Čemez A., *Líder v kontexte politického marketingu*, [in:] *Quo vadis massmedia / Quo vadis marketing*, D. Petranová, R. Nováková, H., Pravdová H. (ed.), Trnava 2011.
4. Čemez A., *Politické líderstvo v kontexte sociálneho zabezpečenia*, [in:] *Systém sociálneho zabezpečenia vo vybraných krajinách EÚ*, O. Bočáková, A. Rehuš (ed.), Brno 2014.
5. Čemez A., *Teoretické aspekty politického líderstva*, [in:] *Interpolis 2012*, A. Kollár, P. Bolfová, Tichá, K. (ed.), Banská Bystrica 2012.
6. Čemez A., Úvod do politického marketingu, [in:] *Médiá v čase krízy*, J. Matúš, J. Kolláriková (ed.), Trnava 2010.
7. Čemez A., Habánik T., *Sociálna bezpečnosť jedinca v kontexte sociálneho štátu*, [in:] *Sociálne zdravie jedinca a spoločnosti*, A. Kozoň (ed.), Sládkovičovo 2014.
8. Habánik T., *Princípy sociálnej ochrany na Slovensku*, [in:] *Aktuálne otázky politiky III.*, O. Bočáková, K. Janas (ed.), Trenčín 2014.
9. Klus M., Adamcová M., *Verejná politika*, Banská Bystrica 2006.
10. Klus M., Mezeiová G., Mydliarová D., *Aktéri verejnej politiky*, [in:] *Teória a prax verejnej politiky*, F. Briška (ed.), Banská Bystrica 2010.
11. Kulašík P., *Politológia*, Hlohovec 2005.
12. Malíková Ľ., *Verejná politika: aktéri a procesy*, Banská Bystrica 2003.
13. Tomeš I., *Obory sociální politiky*, Praha 2011.
14. Tomeš I., Úvod do teorie a metodologie sociální politiky, Praha 2010.
15. Veselý A., *Vymedzení a strukturace problému ve veřejné politice*, Praha 2009.