

*Michal Círner*  
*The University of Prešov*

### **Classical and modern approaches to the study of political ideologies and public policy**

Each of us takes many decisions daily, from relatively less serious, such as what to have for breakfast, when to take medication and what to read, to relatively more serious decisions, such as investing in real estate or changing work or partner. Public policy-makers (politicians and bureaucrats) decide what to regulate, how to propose concrete measures, etc. Their decisions, public policies, solutions that they design and enforce also affect the quality of our lives. It is even more interesting if ideology interferes with public policy-making.

Problems that currently plague public apparatus are solved by most of the utilitarian and practical perspectives of modern management, a completely marginal question remains the perspective of political philosophy on the internal relationship of politics and bureaucracy, when in the technocratic epoch it is unacceptable to debate whether political ideology implemented by the state (in the case of non-democratic political regimes) or political formations that vary in power in Western-type liberal democracies incorporate authorial insights into the functioning of bureaucratic organizations.

Although the post-modern era does not favor ideological stickers and ideologization, the totalitarian systems built on the ideological substrate show intensely the transformation of public administration according to the country's political representation. The totalitarian system is characterized by a strong and branched state apparatus with numerous bureaucracy, with unlimited powers. The ruling political party creates (as a rule) its own party apparatus as the main organizational and management center of the life of society, and this apparatus grows with the state apparatus, and as a result the ruling party becomes a state party. The confluence of politics and the state is evident because the winning ideology claims to be a fixed dogma. The undemocratic system requires repressive elements, and the supervising administration, in order to have its people under the strictest control, can regulate their existence even without the ideological coloring of the regime.

The paradox of the communist regimes known from the 20th century is that: with the successive transition from socialism and the establishment of a classless communist society, the state should die. This indicates that the authorities and officials should be less, the contrast was true. Liberal democracies are not lagging behind in bureaucratization either, they justify the creation and functioning of public institutions, among others as guarantors, spreaders and holders of democratic values. The pattern with the communist experiment is also explicit in that the distinction between an official and a politician is no longer justified.

The difference between the elected political leader and the official is based on the particularity of the politician and the universality of the official. Once a political leader becomes an official representative of society, there is no point in distinguishing between a politician and an official. The Communists thus sought to break the gap between society and the state and to establish ideological and political uniformity. In modern democracy, the distinction between an official and a politician is reflected between the official's administrative power and the executive or legislative powers of the politician. A politician can be an amateur, an official must be an expert. The selection of the official is done according to precise normatives, while the politician is elected.

Thus, in liberal democracies, amateurs can lead experts. The official knows what can be done, but he cannot make his own decisions. He must also maintain neutrality. A cop arrests a traitor, but who is the traitor? The answer gives a politician, not a cop. The politician needs the legitimacy that he gains in free elections, the official does not have such legitimacy, his job is to fulfill the imperatives receives from politicians. The constitutions of democratic states do not attach to any ideology, but political parties have consistently placed themselves in ideological directions for better differentiation (many times only formally). And it is the political parties participating in power.

In a simplified way, it is possible to signal how the public administration is built according to the dominant ideology of the parties participating in the government. One of the criteria is the extent of the state – according to the concept of a minimal or strong state it is mostly possible to determine the urgency of the size of the public apparatus. Classical liberals strive for a minimal state, which means few offices and low powers. Modern liberals are supporters of the welfare state, giving wider eventualities bureaucracy. Exposed is the principle of federalism, according to which power is to be divided between central and local instances of state power, which is the support of liberals for decentralization.

Conservatives associate the stability of order with the functioning of historically established institutions. Conservatives say a strong state is needed to maintain order and a desirable social hierarchy. The function of the state is to maintain public order through its authority and clear and enforceable laws. The specific branches of conservatism include the new right. The conservative new right supports a strong state and repression as an instrument for maintaining morality and order (restoration of the death penalty, the principle of three and enough, increasing the powers of the police). On the contrary, the liberal new right advocates a minimal state, because it regards the state as an instrument of coercion and unfreedom, and in any government it has a rather negative effect on the life of individuality.

Today, evolutionary socialism (democratic) is converging in many ways with modern liberalism. In the political sphere, self-government and instruments of direct democracy are promoted, and equalization of the starting conditions is achieved through redistribution through fiscal policy within the welfare state.

Political parties in power in a democratic system apply their own world-wide vision and the public administration institutions serve them as components of the executive power. Therefore, it is obligatory to set them to correspond to the policy being adopted and to represent it at the same time. This can modify both their internal structure and external powers. This leads to shifting the line between party and career appointments to public offices. Career officials occupy primary political positions, and vice versa, there is party pressure to fill positions that were primarily perceived as civil service positions. There is bureaucratization of politics and politicization of bureaucracy. These negative tendencies, together with their latent non-democratic nature of the bureaucratic organization, are forcing both left and right ideologists to make efforts to curb its widespread impact.

For example, neo-Marxist Miliband accuses high-ranking civil servants of being conservatives. Despite the declared political neutrality, these officials are said to have the same education and social status as industrialists and business managers, so they are in a position to share their ideas, prejudices and a comprehensive view of the world. Against the alternative of professing sympathy, for example for socialism, there are also regulations governing their recruitment and promotion to ensure their ideological rationality.

Another author, Zohal Hessami, presents the reasons why right-wing or left-wing politicians in the public sector, with their ideology of governance, are prone to corruption. The first assumption is that right-wing parties are financed more through donations, entrepreneurship and other activities, so there is reason to believe that these payments support a strong degree of familiarity between entrepreneurs and politicians. Therefore, in a situation where bribes are offered by a company that regularly donates money to a party, right-wingers will be more reluctant to refuse a bribe or even report a crime because they do not want to risk future gifts to their party, thereby jeopardizing their electoral success and political career. In poor countries, voters prefer left-wing groups, because the help of left-wing politicians is the only way for citizens to punish corrupt capitalists. However, with left-wing politicians, the public sector is expanding, opening up wider opportunities for corruption. Not to mention that the long-standing alternative to participate in governance paralyzes the human leftists who are subject to corruption.

On the opposite side of the political spectrum, the emergence of rational choice and public choice theory influences the new right (neoliberalism, neoconservatism). Niskanen argues that the bureaucracy is obscuring internal dynamics (basically selfish career interests) that leads to the strengthening of the state itself and its functions. The ability of appointed officials to dictate political priorities to elected politicians is an explanation of why the state is growing even under governments of extremely different ideological profiles.

The notion that bureaucrats are "by nature" social democrats has serious consequences for the new right, as it reinforces the intention of the new right-inspired governments to push the "frontiers of state" back. The right and left blame themselves in a conflict for bureaucracy, but the complexity of public administration is overwhelmed by ideological harassment, overlapping all sections of society, and must therefore be dealt with interdisciplinarily at the scientific level.

The power of ideology on public institutions in a liberal democracy cannot be glorified or downplayed today. The institutions have been built on a value basis and are undergoing a permanent transformation that we are not aware of because of the pace of time and the rotation of election cycles. The individual ideological elements and constructs left by political party ideologues are cascade in public administration as tree rings and help trace the superiority of specific approaches, but this is not dominant in managerial, organizational, marketing and other approaches.