

EMERGING RATIONALITY AND THE SUBJECT OF LIBERALISM

ION HIRGHIDUȘ, VALENTIN FULGER *

ABSTRACT: *The problem of leadership (a management phenomenon) has attracted a lot of interest thought time, from theoreticians and scholars to practitioners skilled in wide range of science subjects. (sociology, political science, philosophy, organizational management etc.) The leader is generally defined as an individual of a person which has been given the task of coordinating and directing the group's activities, or who, in the absence of an elected leader, has the greatest responsibility in achieving these group functions. The leadership represents nothing more than manner or way of achieving those responsibilities that were taken in charge by the leader. Leadership in practice results in successfully carrying out a task or designing a behavior that will allow the group to remain closely bounded.*

KEY WORDS: *leader; organization; economical organization; liberalism; communitarianism; rationality; emerging rationality; human behaviour*

JEL CLASSIFICATION: *Z10*

1. WHAT IS EMERGING RATIONALITY?

The liberalism has appeared as a wreathed of rationality, being a late version of the latter. As all dynamic forms stabilize and eventually become more conservative, in virtue of a way of thinking based on value, liberalism has surpassed its revolutionary phase to become conservatory regarding its own values. The self orientation that asks in a determined manner to sacrifice a part of society, leads to perverted manifestations. Such an example is emerging rationality.

In psychology, the emerging theory states that emotional behavior is an instant act, a special mobilization of energy in order to cope with an unexpected situation or a danger that seems imminent. Emerging rationality represents an "exit", but beyond any known limits of modern rationality. Given this reason, it must always be compared to a

* Lecturer, Ph.D., University of Petroșani, Romania, ihirghidus@yahoo.com
Lecturer, Ph.D., University of Petroșani, Romania, vifulger@yahoo.com

Weber like vision on society which can be considered “classical”. We know that for Max Weber the paradigm of rationality is developed on the principles of capitalism, on the liberal content that it comprises. Rationality is a historical state of being and it refers to the use of formal control procedures in order to acquire a lawful profit that would ensure its purpose of being a human being (Weber, 1993, p. 44).

We may ask ourselves the question if for Weber the human behavior is completely rational. Just as it results from the analysis in his work **The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism**, the non-rational elements aren't denied as they are to be found in the analysis of social action, where this is divided in four directions: rational-instrumental; rational-value; emotional; traditional (Weber, 1978, pp. 24-26). Rationality is an ideal, the mere result of an abstract thought. Starting from here, we can infer that the existence of rational man may be assessed only if we ignore two categories in the characteristics of human behavior: omission of counting in the religious, sentimental, affective, esthetic etc. elements in human decisions; the omission of actual processes of even the rational decision (Hoffman, 2004, p. 85).

Max Weber's point of view over rationality sets forward the fact that it is not linear, and, as a follow up, we must take account of the fundamental changes that have taken place in theoretical approaches, changes that mark the end of modernity and reach of maturity for capitalism. But this very change may raise some question marks as liberalism and democratic rules may be found in two major situation: a. when liberalism restrains very much the state activities and gives a certain advantage to the elite, which may lead to a conflict between these elites and the large masses; b. when liberalism is mixed up by chance with the rules of democracy it may transform those rules in a personal advantage for certain individuals and structures. The democratic mechanism is broken if there is an obvious political trespass in the economic, on the grounds of certain group interests and not on the grounds of efficiency and objective laws on development.

The answer to the question: **what is emerging rationality?** consists in the very description of the limit situations that may result if the democratic rules are used for antidemocratic interests. Emerging rationality in an organization, in an open society, may be the copy of the existing society at a certain point in time or it may insure its autonomy by setting up own rules, framed in virtue of democratic rights that are interpreted in the spirit of individualism of certain small groups or subjects.

2. COMMUNITARIANISM VERSUS LIBERALISM AND IMPLICITLY CRITICISM ON EMERGING RATIONALITY

The foundations of criticism against emerging rationality may be considered as being part of liberalism criticism. One of the most consistent forms of criticism regarding this subject is the communitarianism criticism. The research for goods made by an individual, believes MacIntyre is generally performed in a context that is defined by those traditions that are part of an individual's lifestyle, and this is applicable to both goods that have to do with professional practice and the ones for a unique life. Mulhall and Swift have identified five themes over which communitarianism and liberalism have disputes: 1. the general concept of individual; 2. socially-opposed

individual; 3. universality of values; 4. subjectivism of values; 5. state neutrality. In what concerns the first theme of anti-liberal criticism, communitarianism scholars accuse the liberal thinkers that they see man apart from his targets. The second issue of anti-liberal criticism is based upon the idea that the individual and his values are determined by the society in which he is brought up. The dispute regarding universality of values is held over the question if liberal values are universal or specific to the geographical area in which they evolved. The fourth theme of the communitarian criticism has in target the morality of liberal society. This is viewed as subjective, states that the individual is the source of values and an objective hierarchy of the values is impossible to achieve. The last theme in discussion is regarding the extent to which the state is involved in showing its adhesion to certain values and disapproval of others. An example regarding this aspect is the subsidizing of culture and setting up massive taxes for gambling. Communitarianism is an extremely new (but with old roots) political and social doctrine, which has as main concerns the formation and structure of communities, who are seen as public actors (that are inside subdued to the Greater Good) in relation to a communitarianist state that is capable of managing and arbitrating the dynamics of these communities.

The inside of these communities is based on the free association of individuals with view to obtaining the common Good, accepted by all as a main purpose of forming that community. The internal values of the community are respect offered to one another and mutual help among community members, as well as among individuals outside the community.

In the eyes of the state all communities have equal rights and responsibilities, and the sum of all communities represents, abstractly - the historical community, the people, the nation. The communities defend the rights of their members and support their member's requirements in front of the state authorities and thought specific methods they control the state, but they comply to the policies it proposes. Just as Michael Sandel, McIntyre invokes history. The individual will always be the carrier of a tradition and will inherit a variety of debts, values and cultural patterns. He insists upon the fact that the inner self finds its moral identity by and through its membership in a community. Unlike the liberal approach, one of explaining the options, McIntyre accentuates the fact that there always is a context in which the individual cannot choose its membership in one community or the other.

The non-competitiveness of internal goods (virtues) is the center of the McIntyre argumentation. These non-competitive goods are "excellences" that individuals wish to acquire. The notion of "excellence" as a standard is crucial because it doesn't imply an interpersonal competition. To reach its own goal, a democratic community must have an "excellence" standard, in terms of which their members should be able to touch their identity seen as individual self participating into what we can call the community self.

The most appropriate way to reach such "excellence" is the one that is involved in the democratic way of existence of a community. In a democratic community, the individual is more involved in a cooperative activity rather than in a competitive activity. This is the only way to reach its self awareness. (regarding this aspect McIntyre's point of view coincides with M. Sandel's) .We ask the question:

What kind of “excellence” may lead to democratic life? This “excellence” would be citizenship, or in McIntyre’s terms “the moral community of citizens”. M. Sandel states that only if the inner self is primary in relation to its targets, may justice be more important than the good. Getting in contradiction with liberalism, Michael Sandel states that not just that the inner self is anything but priority, it also cannot represent more than the final acts as there is no distinguishing between the “self” and “my results”. WE ourselves are partially built by our “finalities” and we don’t choose, but we discover that we are deeply rooted into parts of the general social context. A policy of common Good, as an expression of these finalities, makes us capable “of knowing the common Good just as we cannot know it ourselves.” M. Sandel has a perspective over “cognitive auto-understanding” through which he criticizes Rawls and his idea of priority of right over good and he develops, starting from here, a community theory. Sandel criticizes against Rawles the idea of self and its finalities that lead us to think of a choice self made that is absolutely necessary. I would like to make here a personal comment (this is important in understanding the criticism made by M. Sandel against Rawles’ theory). The existence of grounds in order to act like described above, which should not be reduced to following the own interest, is the mark of a moral concept that in non consequential, thus **deontological**. A theory of right as an impartiality is deontological. It underlines the primary importance of justice amongst moral and political ideals.

Its central thesis may be expressed by this: whereas it is made up from a wide range of persons, each of them having its own goals, interests and beliefs over what is good, society is best organized when it is governed by principles that do not assume among each other a certain concept of what is right; what justifies above all these principles is not the fact that they maximize social welfare or that they promote the good, but more than this the fact that they fall under the concept of just - o moral category given before good and independent on good.

The fact that the basic structure of society is just or not cannot be determined by referring to its consequences, such as maximizing welfare or promotion of good, but by previous criteria that stated before these consequences, independent among each other. The theories of this second type define justice as impartial in the way that what is just cannot be determined by taking into consideration one person’s opinion or another’s, but rather trough formulating a basis with which most will agree once there will be taken into account all points of view: it is requested that people detach themselves from the position they find themselves into, by chance, and adopt an impartial position instead. Even though the communitarianism critic over liberalism can in itself be criticized, it states something that is essential and warns us about the danger that behind the democratic and liberal rules there often hide irregularities that may harm irrecoverably the functioning of society in general and organizations’.

3. LEADERSHIP IN THE CASE OF EMERGING RATIONALITY AT ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL

Generally, leadership is a reciprocal process by which an individual has the possibility to influence and motivate other individuals, in order to determine them to

achieve the group's goals. The definition accentuates some of the key characteristics: leadership is a reciprocal relationship, between certain individuals that are either leader (he determines, sets directions and facilitates the group's behavior) and the subordinates (that accept the suggestions given by the leader). As an act of concept, project and control for all sequences of social action, leadership represents the functional aspect of institutional power, meaning it includes all those action-like models that are axiological motivated and validated by activities that are clearly determined (Buzărnescu, 1999).

Mielu Zlate (2004) makes a synthesis of the main conceptual approaches regarding leadership. Among these, the definition given by G.A. Cole is comprehensive, as it refers to leadership as to a group dynamic process through which an individual influences the members of the ensemble to voluntarily participate to carrying out the tasks and group's objectives, in a temporal segment that is determined. Just as like a lot of other definitions, this too is supported by the idea that the process of leadership has a psycho-social characteristic as it includes all elements of leadership - group, influence and scope. Leadership is, a dynamic way of behavior that implies the valuation of some basic dimensions: leader's traits, attitudes, needs, behaviors and other personal characteristics of the subordinates, the nature of the organization, the scope, structure, the assignments and the social, economic and political environment. Ordway Tead defines leadership as the "art of influencing people in order to determine them to participate to the realization of an objective that they end up considering desirable". The Collins English Dictionary (1998) presents us not just one meaning for this term, but several. Among these, the most comprising for the managerial context is "ability to lead".

The difference between management and leadership comes from the influence imposed by a manager or leader. Management is understood only as an top - down direction and it refers strictly to collaborators, and it implies the idea of administration and control. Leadership hasn't got such limits, it is exercised beyond hierarchical responsibilities and targets all kinds of relations: with collaborators, with colleagues, with the hierarchy and with the clients.

The leadership and the management are two distinct action systems, with certain functions and characteristics. The intersection of the two domains of interest may become major premises of success in a business environment which is more and more complex and changing. The existence of a good manager is a guarantee for order and consistency in an organization, elements that themselves condition key-dimensions, such as quality and profitability. Unlike management, leadership has the ability to face the change. The higher importance given to the leader in the past few years is a consequence of competitively growth and fluctuations in the business world. The major changes are more and more necessary in order for an organization to survive and get in competition efficiently in this new environment that is developing. So, there is a directly proportional relation between change and leadership. The diverse functions of management and leadership attract individual characteristics. While the manager copes with complexity, the leader has in target the setting up of directions that imply certain strategies. The management develops the capacity to realize the plans through organizing and to recruit adequate personnel. The leader's activity consists in direction

people, meaning communicating the new direction to the ones that are suspicious and making them understand his vision and become devoted to its materialization. The difference between the management and the leadership evolves from the method of influencing the staff. The management has as a support the functions of planning, organizing, coordinating and control; the leadership may be exercised outside of the hierarchical boundaries and targets all types of relations. Management means choosing the most profitable path for an organization while leadership indicated the path that has the highest chances to become a success. The leader is associated with an imaginative plan that anticipates and has a cognitive aspect, while the manager is associated with the action plan. The leader seeks into the future, the manager instruments the plan; the first is an architect, the latter is the constructor, you cannot have one without the other, none of them is superior in front of the other, and the possibility of them to be found in just one person is scarce. The harmonization of the architect's and constructor's efforts depends only on their intelligence and interest.

The companies that encourage leadership concentrate on creating new opportunities for their youngest employees. In most cases, decentralization was the key to achieving this objective. Decentralization prepares people for key roles in medium or inferior hierarchical structures. Such strategies help in creating an organizational culture in which people accept the leader's position and access it. One of the minor problems with which today's companies are confronted with is linked to the challenges determined by adaptation needs. The changes that appeared in society and technology force certain organization to develop new strategies and learn new ways of action. In most of the times, the most difficult task of the leaders is the mobilizing of people in adapting to new environmental and work conditions. The mobilizing of an organization in the scope of adapting its course to the new business environment is fundamental, it is the leitmotif of leadership in a competitive world. The organizational changes represent an important factor of stress for people. These are constrained to take on new roles, to hire in new relations, to conform to new rules, behaviors and work approaches. As a result of the experience accumulated through studying the activity of managers around the world, there were found six principles of adaptation to work: "the balcony view", identifying the adaptation mechanisms, stress relief, holding on to disciplined attention, repositioning of people in the field and encouraging leaders of all levels.

According to "the balcony view", leaders must be capable of projecting an exhaustive vision over things, just as if they were above everything, in a balcony. It is not recommended that they become main actors in the field of action. Leaders must feel the context of change and even create it; they must be able to induce to the employees a strong feeling of organization history, to underline the good passed moments, and, as well, to insist on the responsibility of people to mould the future. More than that, the leaders must identify the disjunctive values and power values and to watch closely the functional relations or the dysfunctional one to change. In what concerns the adaptation mechanisms' identification, things are very clear: when the organization cannot rapidly learn to adapt to new challenges, there's the risk it may become extinct.

An important aspect is that at the basis of leadership there's always a team spirit, - defined as a state that reflects the people's acceptance to think, behave and act in harmony in order to reach a common goal. The team spirit is built on certain cumulative aspects: a passed experience that has led to building mutual trust - , assuming a common objective, the existence of convergent interests that lead to a powerful motivation (individual and group motivation) and taking decisions in a participative manner. The team spirit is the result of integration of four processes: building trust among the persons that are involved, the setting up of the mission and of certain clear goals, to which the participants contribute and the rolling of participative decisional processes. The Henley Institute of Management and the Henley Management College have made a study on which they established four essential responsibilities of leadership: setting up the values, image and mission of the company, establishing the strategy and structure, supervising management, the extension of responsibilities to the shareholders.

Many of the efforts of transforming organizations through acquisitions, mergers, restructuring, reengineering and strategic work fail because the managers haven't got a pertinent perspective on the change requirements. They make the classic mistake of handling the adaptation challenges as technical issues that can be resolved by management abilities. This way they underestimate the role of leaders. They are, in fact, the only ones that have the adequate means to compute the profits of restructuring, to understand the future tendency and discontinuity, to identify opportunity, to set competencies and name the mechanisms that are inherent to the strategic direction that was chosen.

Certain leadership myths must be surpassed as these often prevent the reassessment of managerial actions. Leadership means power over others, is one myth. People say that a good leader has the ability to manipulate, to control and determine others to listen. The term leader should be held for those that act in the greater interest of the group and in consensus with the group. Some people are born to be leaders is a statement that has lost its credibility. Research has shown that the concept of innate leader is not valid, and that leadership skills are taught by practice. The association of certain variables of the personality and the leader's efficiency has been proved wrong. So a leader is no genetic accident. "A leader is a leader in any circumstance" is a myth which is correlated to the one of the innate leader. This concept under evaluates the power of environmental circumstances in conditioning a leader's efficiency. "A good leader is a loved leader". Still, a known leader mustn't necessarily be the most loved member of the group. Some leaders may be loved by the members of the group, but inspiring affection is not a key characteristic of a leader. There's another representation that states that the groups prefer not to have a leader. Even though in folk culture it's been said that the ones that are led are envious on the leader's authority, research has shown that this is not always true. In some situations the group functions very well even without the leader. Still, when the duties of the group become complex, the need for coordination rise also, and the satisfaction and productivity of the group are higher when it has a leader.

There are situations in which the leader's weapons may be turned into perversions. The leader has access to two dynamic levers in order to influence his

subordinates: persuasion and seduction. Through persuasion, the leader gets close to its subordinates and through seduction he attracts them. The two influential manners are based on the physical magnetism of the leader (his presence wakes up to action), the magnetism of his intellect, of his ideas and thoughts (the leader is convincing, clear and accessible), the magnetism of his heart (the leader knows how to listen to others) and the soul's magnetism (charisma). The physical attraction may be used with the purpose of building a centripetal relationship, of getting closer to his subordinates. But, if the leader is not sure of himself, if he is a dilettante or has access to the management through illicit means, he will pervert the role that he was attributed with. One of the manifestations of perverted physical magnetism is the simulated activism that works in the disfavor of pro-activism, characteristic to authentic leaders, full of catching energy. A fake leader will inspire fear and inhibition. Other concrete behavioral aspects of perversion are chronic cynicism (the leader is the dominator, using its magnetism of thinking in order to minimize his counterpart), acute cynicism, pathological (manifested through paranoid behavior), that interprets the facts in such a way that they match his own ideas and defend his own interests (a sort of Procust's bed), emotional manipulation, which uses as a technique the Scottish shower, based on an alternation of positive and negative incentives, the leader's ego, that is expressed through a prophetic behavior with apocalyptic menaces in case of insubordination. In the same context, I have noticed that the descriptive analysis of the leader's behaviors has started by setting a list of possible behaviors associated with leadership - planning, setting up a group politic, setting up a reward system and sanctions, and assuming responsibility. This list has grown so much that researchers were forced to reduce the variety of the types of action to some key-dimensions. In the end, four dimensions were chosen: consideration towards the subordinates, the tasks structuring, the development of production and sensibility to human nature. Among these, the first two seem the most important. Consideration assumes relationship orientation and maintaining group unity. Structuring means orientation to the target in order to achieve the goal. In many groups, organized formally, the role of the leader is built explicitly on the group's structure. But, in a group with undefined structure, the role of the leader should be shaped.

The central issue of leadership wonders around the leader's behavior. Aside to the fact that you have to own the perfect combination of aptitudes and experience, the most important question is: how do you act in a leadership role? The behavior of the leader at organizational level finds itself in consonance with emerging rationality. We could say that it's an effect of the latter.

REFERENCES:

- [1]. **Buzărnescu, Ş.** (1999) *Sociologia civilizației tehnologice*, Editura Polirom, Iași
- [2]. **Hoffman, O.** (2004) *Sociologia organizațiilor*, Editura Economică, București
- [3]. **Weber, M.** (1978) *Economy and Society*, University of California Press
- [4]. **Weber, M.** (1993) *Etica protestantă și spiritul capitalismului*, Editura Humanitas, București
- [5]. **Zlate, M.** (2004) *Leadership și management*, Editura Polirom, Iași