

Rural anticipation towards welfare state in Czech Republic

Reflexe projektu sociálního státu na českém venkově

E. KUČEROVÁ

Czech University of Agriculture, Prague, Czech Republic

Abstract: Although empirical findings show the deterioration of living standards in post-communist countries in the 1990s, there are significant differences in the public opinion about the “welfare state” project in countries where more rigorous liberal reforms were implemented and countries with much slower progression towards the liberal model of capitalism. The Czech Republic with its economic development is still on the symbolic crossways to make a decision about how to approach the welfare state. There is a very actively discussed model of an “active approach” (non-state subjects) to social policy with a residual role of the state. The model should have a chance to a more effective implementation in (small) rural communities where social problems can be better identified and resolved. The questions to be asked are that of the potential of social policy actors to participate in the process and the attitudes and approaches to social policy models in rural communities. It should be asked how the opinion of actors can be evaluated in the process of making a new system of social policy which still remains a “reform from above”. The paper follows a preceding qualitative study of the author with a quantitative survey of public opinion on the participation and responsibility in social policy actors’ action and acceptance of the welfare state model based on the liberal model of capitalism. The first part provides a review of international studies on rural poverty in post-socialist states. The main part of paper presents results of a quantitative investigation in one Czech rural community where significant social problems of the welfare state project (unemployment, illness, education, age, living conditions) have been studied.

Key words: public opinion, rural community, questionnaire, welfare state

Abstrakt: Jedním z předpokladů projektu sociálního státu je kromě ekonomických garancí a politické legitimacy také náklonnost veřejného mínění. S ohledem na hospodářský vývoj lze říci, že se Česká republika ocitá na symbolické sociálně politické křižovatce v rozhodování o přístupu ke konceptu Welfare state. Většina konceptů projektu Welfare state akcentuje aktivní přístup klientů k sociálnímu státu (resp. k řešení jednotlivých sociálních problémů – nezaměstnanost, problémy starých, rodin s dětmi, invalidů a nemocných apod.). Předpokladem plnění aktivního přístupu klientů sociálního státu je jejich participace na řešení sociálních problémů. Otázkou je, zda platí předpoklad, že princip participace v sociální politice může být lépe naplňován v malých, venkovských komunitách. Cílem článku je navázat a rozpracovat předchozí autorčinu kvalitativní studii provedenou v české venkovské lokalitě a rozpracovat ji právě tímto směrem – zmapovat veřejné mínění o participaci a odpovědnosti jednotlivých aktérů sociální politiky ve venkovské komunitě.

V článku autorka analyzuje výsledky dotazovacího šetření, které v obci provedla, a které bylo zaměřeno na šest základních sociálních problémů řešených v rámci projektu WS (nezaměstnanost, nemoc, invalidita, vzdělání, bydlení a stáří). U občanů vybrané obce zjišťovala jejich názory na očekávanou a poskytnutou pomoc při zmírňování (příp. řešení) jednotlivých sociálně politických problémů a míru zodpovědnosti aktérů, kteří by mohli/měli být za zmírňování vybraných problémů odpovědní – představitelů obce, představitelů církve a jiných významných autorit obce a dalších jedinců a institucí přesahujících obec.

Klíčová slova: veřejné mínění, venkovská komunita, dotazníkové šetření, welfare state

Analysts have been considering welfare state crisis in the late modernity – particular causes of the crisis, forms and options for solution – for more than twenty years, and because of it, the welfare state theorists speak about the last stage of welfare state development – reconstruction of the welfare state. Looking at theories, we can identify two basic processes: individualisation and gene-

ralisation. The modern individualisation process (Beck in Keller 1996) can be interpreted as the disintegration of certainty and assurance and in the consequence of the needs, finding and realising “new assurance” for individual (for themselves and also for others). Thus, individuals have to effort to be integrated into largely institutionalised and impersonal structure of great social

Paper has been presented during Autumn school for rural sociology, September 2003, Prague and extension version will be proceeded to EEC journal.

systems. Indeed, welfare state is that kind of institution that can offer mechanisms bringing “*new assurance*” to individuals, however, the system is showing an incomprehensive character and variability as an externality of the individualisation process. On the other side, individuals are involved also into the generalisation process when they use impersonal (welfare state) institutions (Konopásek 1998).

Both processes, generalisation and individualisation, are proceeding in parallel and synergy – individuals claim to live how they wish and want to live in the “*coherent world*”. The great extent of abstract systems (complicated and differentiated as the social security system and other welfare state institutions are), non-substituted in the modern welfare state project, tends to social relations disembedding from the local context (Giddens 1998). The degree of the abstract character of the welfare state institutions is strongly related to their chance to exist more abstractedly in the specific local context. We may say that universal, non differentiated institutions, fit to the modern state project, are not figured out with respect to any individual particularity, which some social institutions, emerging in the small (village) community would respect.

When we consider the relation of an individual to the welfare state institutions, one basic approach how to compare social groups and to measure variability between them is poverty. Such phenomena as poverty were under the “ideological embargo” during the communism era and any research investigations concerning it were suppressed. After the communism collapse, researchers have started to study the so-called “*new*” poverty which emerged with the “*new*” socio-economical (capitalist) conditions. I am focusing on the Czech case here¹.

The purpose of the paper is not discussion about ways of reducing poverty through implementation of welfare state model, but it should be reflection of acceptance (following realisation) of the welfare state model in the transformation period 1990ies. There are three possibilities: 1. redistributive model characterised by dominant role of state, but also responsibility and enormous cost for social policy or 2. residual model – radically changed social state policy into “non-state” social policy with dominant role of civil sector (non-profit, non-governmental) in the market economy or 3. corporative model with tendency to established harmony partnership between state and civil sector. The decision has to respect public legitimate to be realising project successful. The alternative assumes harmony between individual’s actions and

welfare state model and individuals will be strengthening model through their action.

GLOBALISATION AND RURAL POVERTY. THE WELFARE STATE INTERVENTION

The societal transformation from socialist centrally planned to post-socialist market economy, can be in broad theoretical view thought as a cultural change being along with structural and economic consequences. When we focus more on nowadays perspectives of rural societies in the late modernity, we have to discuss processes of re-shaping rural and rurality.

Regarding this aim conceptual disputations involved in selected texts of Europe’s Green Ring (Bruckmeier, Kopytina 2001; Granberg, Kovach, Tovey 2001) on post-traditional and post-modern rurality referred to sociological question of socio-cultural subject in post-socialist rural development as a “*inspirative*” framework for highlighting gathered data analysed in the empirical chapter of paper, and decision was led also fact that authors respect in their text affection of transformation and globalisation process toward rural development in Eastern and Central European countries.

Authors (Bruckmeier, Kopytina in Granberg, Kovach, Tovey 2001) understand “*post-traditional*” rurality as a result of modernisation associated with permanent changes of rural society traditions and with “*consuming*” of rural areas and “*colonised*” it by differential social groups, not only rural resources users. Accordingly to the post-traditional rurality they speak about emerging process of “*de-traditionalisation*”. Kovach (Kovach in Granberg, Kovach, Tovey 2001) views de-traditionalisation as a cultural component of de-peasantation and argues the de-peasantation is not isolated structural change, but process strongly influences cultural transformation into post-socialist images in the late modernity, and because of have to be surveying as a multidimensional process (analysing from vary sociological angels – for example the way of transmission knowledge). There are (Granberg, Kovach, Tovey 2001) three levels for analysing process – cultural, structural and societal. The most important for the paper is last one level, societal including also transformation of rural community life.

Empirical part of this paper will be concerning on the process of de-traditionalisation in Czech rural areas in the post-communist time, understanding as a melting-pot newcomers and “*rootage*” locals, and emblematical way

¹ Eyal, Szelényi and Townsley (Eyal, Szelényi and Townsley 2000) approach to the reflections of transition suggested the transition process in the frame neoclassical economic theory and the neo-institutionalist path dependency (Stark 1996) using their concept of trajectory adjustment. They even initiate a new sociological paradigm – neoclassical sociology – to reformulate basic the theorist’s question to identify the “preconditions of capitalist transformation” to “how these various conditions shape and diversify in the actually existing capitalist system”, and argue that the formation of classes in capitalism system is consequential for the type of capitalism system strongly influenced by the circumstances – place and time.

Then, I can categorize the Czech Republic by the character of transformation (Pickel in Mlčoch 1997) into the group of countries where more rigorous liberal reforms were implemented (together with Hungary and Poland) and opposite group involved countries with much slower, gradual progression towards the liberal model of capitalism (Bulgaria, Slovakia and Romania).

also outsiders who have an important influence on rural community life. All these actors will have different social status, social, cultural and economical roots, interests and respect to the community and others important features refers to the shaping development of rural community. And all these actors who have ambitious re-shape rural community, create new local images are, as Kovach stress (Kovach in Granberg, Kovach, Tovey 2001), entered in competition for development resources and strengthening their class position in the rural society.

I am examining in this contribution the Bruckmeier and Kopytina's hypothesis of the rural areas colonisation, which will be investigated at the empirical level only focusing on any aspects influencing rural community by other social structures.

I am analysing the process of de-traditionalisation in the frame of the welfare state in the Czech rural area, focusing on the co-operation between the networked actors living in and outside rural community with regard to their participation in the social policies decision-making. The frame of the welfare state is reduced for rural areas in this paper to one rural community, however, the basic claim for the welfare state (understand it strictly related to the social policy) is to reduce poverty as far as it is possible with assumption of the effective welfare state (Potůček 1995). The process of globalisation shapes not only the redistribution of privileges, poverty², power and many others, but it also contributes to the global re-stratification characterised by strong polarisation of poverty. Global poverty has two basic features – poverty is reduced to the problem of hunger (and does not concentrate on other important consequences: quality of life,

housing problems, education, family crisis and many others resolving through welfare state instruments) and poverty is localised, while wealth is globalised and its impact is not so “real” as in localities (Bauman 2000).

Theoretical “futurological” aiming at the ideal type of de-traditionalised rural society (very hard to test in the empirical way, as Bruckmeier has mentioned) is likely to develop into the “new” (internationalised) welfare state characterised by the co-operating actors networked in the policy arenas with other networked actors (“*pluralised rurality*”).

GLOBAL AND RURAL NETWORKS – THE CZECH CASE

The social policy project is mostly understood and analysed at the national level, although the basic principles – especially subsidiarity and participation – are emphasised as the key principles for an effective welfare state reducing mass poverty. If we would like to answer the question whether and how are these principles realised, it means how they are reflected by the welfare state clients, we have to investigate it at the local/rural level.

The purpose of my investigation was to explore the images emerging in the community, reflections of welfare state which is realised in the post-communist era. The process of welfare state is/can be re-shaped by the public opinion, because of the governments designing social policy project respecting economic, cultural and social circumstances. In the case of the Czech Republic,

² The most extensive and actual socio-economical survey concerning on the poverty problem in the Eastern Europe after the communist era, “miserable time” for any empirical research regarding poverty in the time of transition to market economy, was provided by Ivan Szelényi (Emigh, Szelényi 2001, Szelényi 2001). Szelényi's team gathered empirical data in the selected post-communist countries – Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia – to compare poverty evolution and formation of the underclass. Analysing empirical data showed increasing poverty in all Eastern European countries.

Speaking about findings, absolute poverty rapidly increased in most post-communist countries characterised by the “shock transformation”, culminated in 1991–1993 and then slowly decreased (particularly when we speak about Hungary and Poland). In the case of the Czech Republic, absolute poverty was decreasing till 1991, then slowly increasing (Večerník 1998)). On the other side, in the countries characterised by gradually transition, poverty did not increase so rapidly, but it also did not decrease. Thus, absolute poverty is less likely to be reduced as market institutions developed and as an economic growth occurs (Szelényi 2001). There are significant cross-country differences among the post-communist countries regarding poverty. Szelényi and Emigh (Szelényi, Emigh 2001) examined the hypothesis whether and how, in the particular post-communist countries, two characteristics affected poverty – gender and ethnicity (racialisation and feminisation of poverty). Finally, the authors found out strong racialisation of poverty in most of the studied countries (the process was not detected only in Poland) and made hypotheses about the factors which in the “synergic way” strengthened and affected racialisation of poverty – there is a strong impact on labour market existing in the post-communist era irrespective of ethnicity.

Regarding the process of the feminisation of poverty, we can not speak about the open conjunction due to the historical and cultural background during the communist era. In this case, Fodor (Fodor 2001) underlines character of the emancipation process during the communism era. The distributive welfare state disappearing during the transition has caused disadvantages to women toward men in the labour market. The process of women losing the advantages gained during the communist era was much faster in the “radical” transformation. However, in comparison of the women position and the Romanians position regarding poverty, Fodor (Fodor 2001) argues that women could have reached some advantages after the communism collapse and/or retain them in the post-communist times, while Romanians in most case could have only reached more disadvantages (strongly related to labour market) than before the communism collapse.

There are, in the texts analysing and interpreting the situation in European post-socialist countries (Mitrev; Tomova; Konstatinova; Domanski; Tarkowski; Ladayi in Szelényi and Emigh 2001), several factors impacting and explaining more poverty, measured by the absolute poverty, in each selected country (age, gender and ethnicity in Bulgaria, education and age in Poland, Hungary and in the Czech and Slovak Republic and education, age and ethnicity in Romania).

there are two aspects especially affecting the policy design: the fact that public reaction to the increasing poverty after the communism collapse assumes poverty as a negative impact of transformation and the aspect of market economy. Both aspects contribute to the “instability” (flexible for changes) policy-making toward the welfare state. Whether we (the Czech Republic) will follow rather the residual welfare state model strongly respecting market economy or the “bountiful” welfare state model, depends on the degree of the respect and realising solidarity and participation in the particular localities. The enforcement of solidarity and subsidiarity in the communities improves aiming to the less bountiful (determined, limited) welfare state and I wanted to explore in my case study how it is aiming at the community through measurement of the realising participation and subsidiarity in the frame of social policy problems.

In 1997, I have started my empirical work for my thesis and have chosen a Czech village inhabited by some Romanies. During the fieldwork, I recognised many other sociological tasks for a rural sociologist and also due to good contacts with the informant, I have started studying the community life using qualitative approach for understanding relations between people (with special respect to the relations between Romanies and non-Romanies living in the community, because it was the topic of my thesis), later the biography of actors participating in the local policy decisions.

The studied Czech village is situated about 100 kilometres North-East from Prague, capital city of the Czech Republic. There are about one thousand permanently living people (including only people who permanently live in the village, not people who use the rural space only for recreation, people who have their summer cottages there). The average age of the population is 33,8 years, and almost 60% of the inhabitants are in the economically active age. Generally, we can characterise the “Village” from the economical point of view: it is situated in the region (Semily) which is not extremely favourable, but also it is not the region with the above-average conditions. On the local political stage, there are 13 elected councillors including five members of local council committee and the mayor. In the last local council elections (Autumn 2002), there participated seven political parties – three of them are “independent” (Nezávislí – Independent, Sdružení nezávislých kandidátů – Association of Independent Candidates and Zcela nezávislí – Totally Independent), Czech Social Democratic Party (Česká strana sociálně demokratická), Civic Democratic Party (Občanská demokratická strana) and Christian Democratic Party (Křesťansko demokratická unie – Československá strana lidová). The most successful party was in the “Village” the Czech Social Democratic Party (the mayor is a member of it).

Although the case study is based on the quantitative approach (questionnaire survey), the project design and analysis respect qualitative data collected in the prevailing surveying. The qualitative study has brought few social problems emerging in the community which could

use the principles of subsidiarity and participation of local people for resolving it. The housing problem of the local Roma family and the problem connected to the local basic school were the most escalated problems in the community, which I have investigated and presented last year at the Autumn School in Lodz.

When I had identified the basic principles of the local political arena (actors, cooperative and competitive relations between the particular actors, local problems and their resolving and contribution of the actors to it), I needed to complete the “picture” of the local policy-making in the village through the local public opinion. Due to a good knowledge about the situation and the relevant circumstances about village reached through the large qualitative investigation, I have designed a questionnaire to gather data measuring the position of families in the life cycle with respect to their poverty situation (detailed identification of the respondent family structure), attitudes towards the welfare state models (items measuring the affinity to the three welfare state models – redistributive, residual and corporative), evaluation of actors (who were identified during the former qualitative investigations). The last mentioned section concerning dual evaluation of actors is crucial for the further analysis: respondents evaluated actors according to the degree of their willingness to help local people, and the expected responsibility of actors in six selected social problems (unemployment, education, age, health and disablement, housing problems). From the social policy angle, we can say the expectation will give us the answer to the question who and how should be responsible in the problems more or less resolved by the welfare state instruments. Data gathered in the first stage of project (analysed in this paper) included 69 respondents (42% of the population), next phases will include questioning in three selected Czech village with the assumption of more than 300 questionnaires for analysing. I have used (and will use) the purposive selection to address every family living in the community.

The analysis provided by the SPSS program I have divided into three sections. First section is focused on analysing the public opinion regarding the responsibility of resolving six selected social problems. The question is, whether the people are significantly differentiated in their expectations to the actor’s responsibility regarding the particular problems or not. I have used K-means cluster analysing to classify people with different attitudes into groups. There emerged three groups (see Table 1) differentiated by the approach to resolving problems – first we can call “abandoned”, represented by more than half of respondents, because they are strictly against any responsibility to the social problems, second group involved people also refusing any responsibility of actors, except the responsibility for rendering the old age services. The group, slightly more than one third of respondents, can be called “traditionalists”, and the last group, few and far between, is the “welfare oriented” group which involved people who would expect actor’s responsibility for all six social problems, es-

pecially they have accentuated the responsibility for old age services and resolving housing problems.

Respondent's basic characteristics with respect to division into three groups say that the first (abandoned) and third (welfare state oriented) group are of clean-cut shaping, while the second one does not seem so. The first group is represented by older (more than 50 years), less educated, strongly rooted people (who were born and live for all their life in the community), while the third group, welfare oriented people, included highly educated, young (less than 35 years) people, and is typical by the most of invaders. The second group, traditionalist, are mostly women who moved outside the community, not specified by age or education.

Second part of the analysis examined also the task of the respondent's approach to the responsibility of actors. While the first part classified the concern on actor's responsibility to problems, the second put emphasis on the actors participating in the problem resolving. Then, the question for analysing is, whether there are significant differentiations between the evaluation of actors participation in the making or not. I have processed, as in the first section, K-means cluster analysis with respect to three levels of the actors distance to the community: 1. locals – the most closely related people (relatives and neighbours), 2. intermediate actors – mostly living in the community, who were identified in the former qualitative investigation as important for the local policy making (for example the mayor, the local doctor, teachers and the director of local basic school, church), and 3. outsiders (regional officers responsible for education and other problems, labour office). Considering to the distance of actors to the community, we can describe three groups as having arisen from the cluster analysis (see Table 2).

The biggest group covering almost half of the respondents can be characterised by their approach to social policy as the people approving of the *redistributive welfare state model*, because the majority of them claimed strong responsibility of all actors, it does not matter, if they are local or not. The second group looks was opposite to the first one, the respondents included in it are typical by the tendency to support the *residual welfare state model*. They represented about one third of the respondents and their assumption, that an individual should be in most of the cases responsible for his/her social problems resolving rather than the welfare state, are valid for the local, intermediate actors and also for the outsiders. The least represented group (16%)

could be the potential for the representatives of the corporation welfare state model, which does not reduce nor overestimate the role of the state, but the state role is changeable only for some social policy sectors and in other it keeps an important position (for example education services). Results of the analysis (clustering) examined opinion of respondents (representatives corporate model) through the social distance to the community, supported inclination to the corporative welfare state model, although not so effective as theoretically it should be: Actors strongly and mediate networked into community (locals and intermediate actors) are almost not expected to be as responsible for social problems resolving (except actors providing health services) as outsiders are (except church).

Although basic identifiable features of every of three groups are not distinctive at all, we can find few differences. The last group, respondents supporting corporative welfare state model, is the most clear in the characteristics of age, education and gender. There is a strong support of less educated women and the group is – in the comparison to the others – the “oldest” one. The groups of the residual and redistribute model have a dual level of the education of respondents – polarised into less educated and highly educated respondents. While the residual model is more supported by older man, the redistribute model is characterised by the youngest respondents (a strong relation to the group up to 35 years), strongly rooted into the community and more represented by women than men.

Third part of processing the used data regarded actor's willingness to help to resolve problems. I examined the degree of help to people living in the community – whether the local with comparison to the network of outsiders participation is stronger or not. In the three computed networks corresponding to the distance of actors to the community, the local, intermediate and outsiders network, we can answer the question about the degree of the networked actors into every level of network and then answer how strongly globalised the community is or not. If we assume a not globalised community, in the local network there will be dominant the category including strongly networked actors and the minimum would be represented by occasionally and non-related actors and respectively it would be works for the community “*restricted*” towards globalisation. The results for the examined community have not brought a clear evidence about strong globalisation, although there is some. The first

Table 1. Responsibility cluster No. 1 ($N = 69$)

	Per cent	Valid per cent	Cumulative per cent
Abandoned	49.3	51.5	51.5
Traditional	30.4	31.8	83.3
Welfare oriented	15.9	16.7	100.0
Total	95.7	100.0	

Table 2. Responsibility cluster No. 2 ($N = 69$)

	Per cent	Valid per cent	Cumulative per cent
Residual WS	36.2	36.2	36.2
Redistribute WS	47.8	47.8	84.1
Corporative WS	15.9	15.9	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	

evidence of data is that all respondents, regardless the distance to the community, are not willing to participate on the social problems resolving (non-willing in tree categories, locals, intermediate actors and outsiders, fluctuate between 40% to 80%). The detail view does not brings strong evidence about globalised community, because willing to participate on the social problems resolving representatives one fifth of locals, however, outsider's willing is twice stronger than locals and willing of intermediate actors is even more than twice stronger than locals. The "potential" is group of intermediate actors, because with comparison to local and outsider network are ready contribute to the active social policy at the local level.

Three stages of the analysis measured how the community is globalised through the approach of the respondents to being active, participating in the social policy project and contributing to the welfare state. First section divided respondents into three groups (abandoned, traditional and welfare state oriented) by their attitudes to social policy problems – whether there are ready to participate in the resolving of social problems or not. Second group division (residual, redistributive and corporative welfare state) classifies members of the community by their willingness to respect the general social policy model designed by the state and to fit their action to it : to participate in the social problems resolving and to be responsible for themselves and people living in the community. And the last analysis covered the first and second section, because did not involve only the potential of social policy actors living in the community, but also looked on the community members as on the actors who participate, more or less, in the community resolving problems.

Regarding the results of the first and second analyses, there is an assumption that the welfare state oriented actors and actors who do not support the redistributive model of welfare state are prepared for the social policy models which are minimally dependent on the state. They are prepared to be or they are globalised. The independence of the community is proved by the "positive" results of the third stage of analysing. The positive "result" means networked locals and intermediate actors into the community as strong as possible.

In the case of the "Village", we can say that community is not globalised, because the representation of the welfare orientated people (16.7%) is minimal and that of the people supporting the redistributive welfare state mode is the widest (47.8%). Thus, willingness to participate in the resolving of social policy problems and not just "stay and wait" who will help me/us, is absolutely weak. The actors who have the chance to change the rate of the community non-flexibility to the globalised processes should be highly educated, younger rural invaders. The subsidiarity principle (analysed in the third part) is also not "mature" in community. The "potential" group are the intermediate actors who are willing (more than four fifths) to participate in the social policy problems without regard whether they are successful or not. Because the locals

(relatives and neighbours) and outsiders (regional officers and other regional organisations) are not strongly networked, the intermediate actors have more potentials to realise their "local social policy", they have an open way to contribute to the welfare state and to strengthen the community against the globalisation processes.

The local social policy is mostly provided through the active social policy. To the contrary the passive social policy, when people are in the role of "passive client" of the welfare state ("sitting and waiting" if anybody, most probably a state institution, will help them to resolve their social problems), active social policy, when actors overcome the "passive role of client" to help themselves or other people (members of family or community) with social problems corresponds to the endogenous rural development. Both approaches – in the social policy active and in the rural development endogenous - are characterised by the chance for rural inhabitants making decisions about the rural community and the life of their members. The necessity of this chance is prompted in the Czech Republic by the fact, that rural population does not trust the policy created outside countryside, in the cities (Hudečková, Lošťák 1995).

CONCLUSION

The present analyses and theoretical disputations about rural areas and life in rural communities have to respect the great social change to the post-traditional rural society, which is pluralised in activities, norms, attitudes and so on probably much more than it were anywhere before. The differences emerged not only among rural communities with regard to the social, political and economical disparities, but also inside the community, among the members of the community. First dissimilarity can be determined by the way of making (social) policy. Beck (Beck in Giddens 2001) has offered emerging "sub-policies", it means transition globalised policy more close to the human, thus meaning dislocated policy making arena from the government level to the local where there are particular problems solved using specific instruments fitted to the local circumstances. But it means to find a new (localised) policy fitted to the post-traditional rural society, fitted to the transitional post-communist countries. The key question is, which way? Can it be the "third way" designed by Giddens (Giddens 2001)?

The third way and active/passive actors have to reflect on the background of globalisation which can be reflected in various angles: the globalisation can be understood as a hope as well as a destruction. The variability of the globalisation phenomena is "prescribed" by social actors who reflect it from their own point of view and interpret it in different consequences. The interpretation of the globalisation process is affected by the actor's roles, their positions and activities (Lošťák 1998).

The survey in the Czech village brings to light the motive of power for providing local social policies in the group of intermediate actors. Nowadays, the conditions

for their action in the rural communities is determined by the “traditional force” of people not oriented to the welfare state. The civil society is for active intermediate actors a challenge to realise their activities and to strengthen their social position in the community and also to strengthen their orientation to the corporative or residual welfare state model and the reduced power of the group of people supporting the redistributive model of the welfare state rebuilt on the communism heritage.

The majority of poor people have not (or are losing) the energy to participate through the civil society mechanism in the re-shaping (aiming) of social policy, although they may know that it could be the way to reduce their poverty. This fact can prompt the activity of the intermediate actors in rural community. The paradox is that the resistance of the “traditional” rural community members against the intermediate actors activities, in other ways the resistance towards educated invaders willing to participate in the rural life and active social policy, does not strengthen the rural community against the globalisation processes.

REFERENCES

- Bauman Z. (2000): *Globalizace. Důsledky pro člověka*. Praha.
- Bruckmeier K., Kopytina M.A. (2001): *Post-traditional or Post-modern Rurality? Cases from East Germany and Russia*. In: Granberg L., Kovách I., Tovey H. (2001): *Europe's Green Ring. Perspectives on Rural Policy and Planning*. Wiltshire.
- Elster J., Offe C., Preuss U.K. (1998): *Institutional Design in Post-communist Societies*. Cambridge.
- Emigh R.J., Szelényi I. (2001): *Poverty, ethnicity, and gender in Eastern Europe during the market transition*. London.
- Eyal G., Szelényi I., Townsley E. (2000): *Making Capitalism Without Capitalists*. London. New York.
- Fodor, E. (2001). *The Feminisation of Poverty in Six Post-State Socialist Societies*. *Review of Sociology of the Hungarian Sociological Association*, 7 (2): 91–108. Budapest.
- Giddens A. (1998): *Důsledky modernity (Consequences of Modernity)*. Praha.
- Giddens A. (2001): *Třetí cesta (The Third Way. The Renewal of Social Democracy)*. Praha.
- Granberg L., Kovách I., Tovey H. (2001): *Europe's Green Ring. Perspectives on Rural Policy and Planning*. Wiltshire.
- Hudečková H., Lošťák M. (1995): *Social Cost of Transformation in the Czech Agriculture*. *Eastern European Country-side*, (1): 81–90, Torun.
- Keller J. (1996): *Sociologie a byrokracie (Sociology and Bureaucracy)*. Praha.
- Konopásek Z. (1998): *Estetika sociálního státu (The Aesthetic of the Welfare State)*. Praha.
- Kováč I. (2001): *De-pesantation of Hungarian Rurality*. In: Granberg L., Kovách I., Tovey H. (2001): *Europe's Green Ring. Perspectives on Rural Policy and Planning*, Wiltshire.
- Kučerová E. (2002): *Active social policy as a chance for endogenous rural development*. *Agricultural Economics – Czech*, 4 (12): 554–558, Praha.
- Lošťák M. (1998): *Různá vnímání globalizace a české zemědělství (Different Perceptions of Globalisation and the Czech Agriculture)*. In: Filipov I., Praha.
- Mlčoch L. (1997): *Zastřená vize ekonomické transformace (The Blear Vision of the Economical Transformation)*. Praha.
- Potůček M. (1995): *Sociální politika (Social policy)*. Praha.
- Stark D. (1992): *Path Dependence and Privatization Strategies*. *East Central Europe. East European Politics and Societies*, 6 (1): 17–51.
- Szelényi I. (2001): *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Gender in Transitional Societies – Introduction*. *Review of Sociology of the Hungarian Sociological Association*, 7 (2): 5–10, Budapest.
- Večerník J. (1998): *Zpráva o vývoji české společnosti 1989–1998 (Ten years of rebuilding capitalism: Czech society after 1989)*. Praha.

Arrived on 20th October 2003

Contact address:

Ing. Eva Kučerová, Česká zemědělská univerzita v Praze, Kamýcká 129, 165 21 Praha 6-Suchbát, Česká republika
tel.: +420 224 382 310, e-mail: kucerova@pef.czu.cz
