UDC 316; 330.341

VALERII PYLYPENKO,
Doctor of Sciences in Sociology, Principal Research Fellow at the Department of History and Theory of Sociology, Institute of Sociology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv

GUL'BARSHYN CHEPURKO,
Doctor of Sciences in Sociology, Head of the Social Expertise Department, Institute of Sociology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv

Modernisation Processes as Seen in Light of the Theory and Methodology

Abstract

The paper discusses theoretical and methodological perspectives on the study of modernisation processes, which is of great importance nowadays. A global theory of modernisation is thought to be a set of specific theories designed for several areas such as economy, politics and culture. The development of this theory is regarded as consisting of three major stages. The first one spanned the period from the mid-1940s to the mid-1960s, when all modernisation theories were being built in either the stream of Western liberalism or that of Marxism. At the second stage, all of those diverging theories were revised in order to clarify whether they could be put into practice. The next phase dates back to the late 1980s — the years when the socialist world-system was falling apart. This period is marked by attempts to develop the global theory of modernisation as a combination of specific systemic theories. The main characteristics of modernisation processes are analysed in the context of transition from traditional to modern society. Modernisation models are multidimensional; therefore, they should take into account, as far as possible, changes in the character of social relations and social structures. It should also be noted that the implementation of these models may engender new social controversies and conflicts or intensify existing ones. Consequently, there is an urgent need for "flexible", multiple factor models of modernisation, which

will encompass historical background (first of all, national and civilisational specifics) of a country, along with examples of successful development of today's advanced societies. An important conclusion of the modernisation theory is the thesis that this transition process takes place in two stages. At first, a country should carry out modernisation reforms relying on its own resources, then it will seek foreign support. However, modernising countries are often fraught with conflicts, both internal and external. Thus, if a country has already used up domestic resources and decides to apply for foreign assistance, not only foreign partners' interests but also (primarily) national security concerns must be taken into consideration.

Keywords: *society, modernisation processes, modernisation models, transformation, changes, theoretical and methodological analysis, economy, politics, culture*

ВАЛЕРІЙ ПИЛИПЕНКО,
доктор соціологічних наук, головний науковий співробітник відділу історії і теорії соціології Інституту соціології НАН України, Київ

ГУЛЬБАРШИН ЧЕПУРКО,
доктор соціологічних наук, завідувачка відділу соціальної експертизи Інституту соціології НАН України, Київ

Модернізаційні процеси у світлі теорії та методології

Анотація

У статті розглядаються актуальні питання теоретико-методологічного дослідження модернізаційних процесів. Аналізується розвиток ґлобальної теорії модернізації як сукупності конкретних теорій у сферах економіки, політики та культури. Виокремлено три етапи: перший етап — середина 1940–1960-х років — характеризується двома ґлобальними напрямками модернізаційних теорій: західного лібералізму і марксистської орієнтації. Другий етап полягає в переоцінюванні першого етапу (з обох сторін) на предмет практичної реалізації. Третій етап — розвиток ґлобальної теорії модернізації як сукупності конкретних теорій. Цей етап триває з кінця 1980-х років, тобто з часу розпаду світової соціалістичної системи. При цьому головні характеристики модернізаційних процесів розглядаються у контексті переходу від традиційних до сучасних суспільств. Моделі модернізації є багатовимірними й мають різно-

бічно враховувати зміни характеру суспільних відносин та соціальних структур. Реалізація моделей також може породжувати певні (нові) суспільні суперечності та конфлікти або загострювати старі. Тому сьогодні "ціннішими" є гнучкі, багатофакторні моделі модернізації, ґрунтовані на синтезі традиційної специфіки розвитку (передусім цивілізаційної й національної) та сучасних прогресивних зразків. Важливим висновком теорії модернізації є теза про два етапи цього розвитку. Йдеться про те, що перший етап зосереджений на розвитку за рахунок внутрішніх ресурсів, а другий передбачає активніше залучення зарубіжної допомоги. Країни, що модернізуються, мають потужні джерела як внутрішніх, так і зовнішніх конфліктів. Тому за умов вичерпання внутрішніх ресурсів характер та інтенсивність зовнішньої допомоги доцільно визначати, керуючись як інтересами іноземних партнерів, так і міркуваннями власної безпеки.

Ключові слова: *суспільство, модернізаційні процеси, моделі модернізації, трансформація, зміни, теоретико-методологічний аналіз, економіка, політика, культура*

ВАЛЕРИЙ ПИЛИПЕНКО,
доктор социологических наук, главный научный сотрудник отдела истории и теории социологии Института социологии НАН Украины, Киев

ГУЛЬБАРШИН ЧЕПУРКО,
доктор социологических наук, заведующая отделом социальной экспертизы Института социологии НАН Украины, Киев

Модернизационные процессы в свете теории и методологии

Аннотация

В статье рассматриваются актуальные вопросы теоретико-методологического исследования модернизационных процессов. Анализируется развитие глобальной теории модернизации как совокупности конкретных теорий в сферах экономики, политики и культуры. Выделены три этапа: первый этап — середина 1940–1960-х годов — характеризуется двумя глобальными направлениями модернизационных теорий: западного либерализма и марксистской ориента-

ции. Второй этап заключается в переоценке первого этапа (с обеих сторон) на предмет практической реализации. Третий этап — развитие глобальной теории модернизации как совокупности конкретных теорий. Этот этап продолжается с конца 1980-х годов, то есть со времени распада мировой социалистической системы. При этом основные характеристики модернизационных процессов рассматриваются в контексте перехода от традиционных обществ к современным. Модели модернизации являются многомерными и должны разносторонне учитывать изменения характера общественных отношений и социальных структур. Реализация моделей также может порождать определенные (новые) общественные противоречия и конфликты или обострять старые. Поэтому сегодня более "ценными" являются гибкие, многофакторные модели модернизации, которые должны основываться на синтезе традиционной специфики развития (прежде всего, цивилизационной и национальной) и современных прогрессивных образцов. Важным выводом теории модернизации является тезис о двух этапах этого развития. Речь идет о том, что первый этап сосредотачивается на развитии за счет внутренних ресурсов, а второй предусматривает более активное привлечение зарубежной помощи. Модернизирующиеся страны имеют мощные источники как внутренних, так и внешних конфликтов. Поэтому в условиях исчерпания внутренних ресурсов характер и интенсивность внешней помощи целесообразно определять, руководствуясь как интересами иностранных партнеров, так и соображениями собственной безопасности.

Ключевые слова: *общество, модернизационные процессы, модели модернизации, трансформация, изменения, теоретико-методологический анализ, экономика, политика, культура*

Modernisation theory is based on the idea of human progress. Historically, this idea originated a relatively short time ago. As long as humans were unable to exert considerable influence on the natural environment and agrarian societies were "bound" to maintain a stable balance (which implied that no major changes occurred within one or even over several generations), the idea of human progress seemed rather unrealistic. The situation started to change only when steady economic growth took place. As the Commercial Revolution of the Late Middle Ages set the stage for pre-industrial capitalism in urban areas of Western Europe, economic growth began to continually outpace population growth. This gave rise to humanism as a philosophical doctrine. The idea that technological innovations (which had emerged due to the systematic development of science) would allow humans to overcome limitations imposed on them by laws of nature, contested the established view that human freedom and self-realisation were only possible in the afterlife. Science became the source of true knowledge and, moreover, the primary opponent of the Church since it cast doubt on an unbreakable belief in the divine revelation. The intellectual monopoly of the Church, which contended that the feudal world order would last forever, was thereby challenged. The idea of human progress came into being, which underlay the modernisation theory.

The concept of modernisation, being quite often narrowly interpreted, engenders a certain amount of scepticism (yet not always well grounded) about modernisation theories. These theories, in fact, are able to give a comprehensive

picture of processes that are far "deeper" than they are usually considered. In the authors' opinion, the term "modernisation" should not only be used to describe the transition from traditional to modern society, but also the latter's enhancement. It is the "enhancement", improvement of social institutions and social relations that the concept of modernisation primarily includes, thereby differing from such concepts as "development", "transformation", "change", etc., which hardly ever account for the dynamics of social progress or progressive trends. Modernisation relates to the creative transformation of society.

Roughly speaking, there are three stages in the development of a global theory of modernisation seen as a collection of specific theories devised by individual scholars and research teams [Mikhal'chenko, 2001: pp. 43–45].

The initial stage lasted from the mid-1940s to the mid-1960s. The end of the Second World War prompted the emergence and development of quite a few modernisation theories, which, by and large, belonged to the two opposing streams. The first one represented theories embracing Western liberalism. Western social scientists greatly appreciated their countries' contribution to the victory over the Axis powers (Germany, Italy and Japan) in political, economic and cultural aspects. Modernisation theories of the second stream strictly adhered to Marxism. The USSR and its supporters described their role in the victory in the Second World War as an important phase of the world communist revolution, as a victory against capitalism. Concurrently, they started to work on a utopian modernisation project whose principal objective was a landslide victory of communism throughout the world. Within that project, the Third World nations were going to be used as a "drawing board".

The next stage could be characterised as a wholesale reassessment of what had been done by then. All theories were scrutinised in order to make sure that they would be feasible. The early and mid-1960s were marked by a serious confrontation between capitalist and socialist world-systems, competition for military superiority, which ended up in stalemate. The two superpowers were involved in a long-lasting fight against each other. They did not resort to nuclear weapons, albeit the Berlin Crisis of 1961, as well as the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, could have led to a nuclear war.

The third phase is about attempts to produce a global theory of modernisation, which will incorporate all specific systemic theories. This phase dates from the late 1980s — the period when the socialist world-system was irreversibly disintegrating. Post-socialist states are currently making appreciable efforts to integrate themselves into the community of democratic nations, which, in their turn, are building civilised social states where human rights and civil liberties (of both an individual and organisation) are supposed to be guaranteed and protected.

At the moment, modernisation theory is turning into a tool for research and explanation of new pathways to development, drawing on the experience of advanced countries. Being universal in nature, this experience, however, can be applicable to a particular country or society since it is harmoniously combined with their historical traditions and sociocultural values. This is a case of transition from spontaneously understood modernisation processes to well-thought-out modernisation strategies, when practical actions are undertaken in view of certain theoretical propositions.

As for historical context of the modernisation theory, it can be traced back to the Renaissance — once humans felt sure that technological progress would enable them to take control of nature. The idea of progress had an impact on social philosophers too. Yet, no sooner had this idea been born, a contrary doctrine came into existence (and still exists today). Proponents of that doctrine claim that social decay is inescapable and the world will go back to what it was in the "dark" Middle Ages.

In an industrial society, the technical apparatus of production and distribution does not merely function as the sum total of institutions (which may be isolated from their social and political effects): it is a system which directly determines both the end product of this apparatus and the operations necessary for the latter's further development and maintenance. Mechanised and standardised production puts some political and economic restrictions on a kind of labour, type of employment, as well as material and intellectual culture. Industrial society has a lot in common with totalitarian one — by virtue of the way it organises its technological base. Totalitarianism does not necessarily manifest itself in specific forms of government or party rule — it extends to distinct forms of production and distribution, which may well be compatible with political pluralism. Political forces assert themselves through control over technological progress and organisation of managerial or administrative apparatus. Governments of industrial countries will not be able to secure themselves unless they marshal all available scientific and technical resources.

The concept of information society is better understood when compared to mass society, which believed to have emerged in the 1920s. This type of society was exhaustively analysed by Herbert Marcuse in the book "One-Dimensional Man". The ideas foregrounded in this work are fairly consistent with the postulates of post-industrialism. Marcuse draws attention to the two phenomena: a) totalitarian nature of mass society; b) a new stage of alienation which entails a "one-dimensional man".

Mass society requires absolute submission and immediate, automatic identification (which may have been characteristic of primitive forms of association). These forms re-emerge in advanced industrial civilisation, and the new "immediacy" appears as a product of sophisticated management and organisation. Alienation, in turn, is different from what it used to be too. At this stage, as Marcuse puts it, "individuals identify themselves with the existence which is imposed upon them" and find in it a source of "their own development and satisfaction" [Marcuse, 2002: p. 13].

In terms of modernisation, information society is an integral part of the modernisation process. This type of society can be described as decentralised (or tending to be so). Decentralisation, in turn, may be helpful in reducing alienation, which is usual for industrial society. Information society attaches great importance to social information, which covers all politically and socially relevant topics. Social information is an essential component of power; moreover, it is inherent in the very concept of power. An Italian sociologist Franco Ferrarotti identified three types of social information, which is used (and may also be exploited) for one's own purposes: a) information regarding social safety and insurance; b) concerning rational social action and means needed to accomplish its

ends; c) information on the rational planning of social change [Ferrarotti, 1985: p. 126].

The Marxist version of modernisation theory roundly criticised the exploitation of workers, typical of early industrial society, and put forth a utopian solution to this problem, which allegedly would lead humanity to peace and freedom from exploitation.

Yet, many of Marx's predictions turned out to be wrong. Today hardly anyone believes that the world proletarian revolution will happen. Nevertheless, the thesis that technological innovations and socio-economic development produce fairly foreseeable results in such areas as politics and culture is still valid. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels published "The Communist Manifesto" in 1848 — by then, only a handful of countries had been industrialised. Hence, the working class was weak, scanty and harshly exploited. They saw industrialisation as the backbone of economic development and held that the working class would grow and, finally, take power.

Adam Smith and Karl Marx developed competing versions of modernisation theory. The former is known as the "Father of Capitalism", whereas the latter was an ardent advocate of communism. They never saw eye to eye on such subject as modernisation ways, models or varieties. Yet, both agreed that technological innovations and their socio-economic outcomes form the basis for human progress and drive major changes in political institutions and culture. Furthermore, Marx argued that socio-economic development determines changes in people's value orientations. Dominant social values and moral norms constitute the ideological "superstructure" of a society, and any tangible changes in its socio-economic "base" will unavoidably bring about changes in the ideology as well. The competition between the two above-mentioned versions of modernisation theory broke out after the Second World War, when the two superpowers — the capitalist and the communist — came into being. They espoused opposing political ideologies and expressed contrary viewpoints on the way and the ultimate goal of development, but both of them were committed to economic growth, social progress and modernisation.

Meanwhile, another version of modernisation theory emerged in the USA. According to this theory, a country's underdevelopment resulted from its peculiarities such as traditional economy, institutions, culture, the population's mindset, etc. It was also contended that traditional values were not merely transient. They could — and ought to — be replaced by modern ones, which would enable backward countries to follow the capitalist (in other words, well-nigh inevitable) path of development. The rich, developed nations were expected to be the driving forces of this process, whose task was to stimulate modernisation of the rest of the world through economic, political, cultural and military assistance.

In any country, modernisation will be successful only if political power is exercised collectively, not being the prerogative of an individual, a social group or class. Social information pertinent to the process of collective social planning is necessary for the following reasons: a) it helps to secure social initiatives from the ruinous influence of bureaucracy; b) guarantees effective "bottom-up pressure" through a network of autonomous social institutions that enable popular participation in the process of social transformation (or modernisation); c) ensures that political decisions and changes being made really match ordinary people's needs

and preferences. Citizens, in turn, should have the opportunity to control any social changes (e. g., in what manner they are being implemented, what is expected to be accomplished, how long it has taken to achieve the planned results, etc.). In so doing, they will be able to prevent bureaucratic and authoritarian tendencies. Besides, a certain degree of political, economic and cultural freedom should be granted to everyone.

Economic freedom is a broad (and rather vague) concept. It is also a latent parameter, which can only be measured indirectly, by means of a priori models. However, these models only work well in a local context — due to their topological (unalterable) properties, which engenders empirical uncertainty. A researcher can structure empirical evidence concerning evolution (i. e. modernisation) of a society using graphs built for catastrophe theory[1]. Finding critical points on these graphs helps to better understand and systematise conditions when the society is nearing a critical state. For example, a crisis is very likely to happen if overproduction is coupled with under-consumption.

Theoretical and methodological aspects of modernisation in various areas of social life are being increasingly discussed in scientific literature. Attention is chiefly paid to economic and political modernisation. Cultural modernisation is perceived quite ambivalently. In general, different areas of social life "react" differently to modernisation efforts of the elite, authorities, political parties, social groups, etc. The same goes for regions and countries.

In the 20th century, economic modernisation was predominantly analysed using the two approaches: capitalist (based on a free market economy) and socialist (centred on a planned economy). Neither of these approaches is free from shortcomings; by the same token, each of them has certain merits. For that reason, in practice, both approaches have converged. Market economy looks with favour upon planning and forecasting techniques, whilst its socialist counterpart opts for various market mechanisms enabling its successful integration into the global economy. The People's Republic of China, for instance, embodies a convergent model, albeit this fact is not always acknowledged for ideological reasons.

As far as economic modernisation in post-Soviet states is concerned, its pace, style and effects are different, and what is more, they are felt differently in each country. The goals and tasks of key reforms are clearly defined and not called into question. But when it comes to how the reforms should be introduced and sustained, the picture is quite the opposite. Political and economic elites of each country strongly disagree over the approaches to reforms — owing to ideological divergences between political parties (e. g., neocommunist and pro-market) or groups of the governing elite, as well as the vested interests of elites, groups or clans.

Both the political divide and clash of business interests can impede modernisation, thereby deteriorating the economic environment of a country. Economic problems, in turn, can give impetus to changes in the political arena. It is a

[1] Catastrophe theory, credited mainly to a French mathematician René Thom, is a mathematical tool used to study and make predictions of processes involving sudden changes. Actually, this sudden change is called a catastrophe. It is not necessarily a natural or man-made disaster, or even a dramatic event.

well-known fact that Karl Marx pinned his revolutionary hopes on the impoverished proletariat. Marx was convinced that the worse the condition of the working people was, the more likely they would feel the need to transform society through revolution and the more readily they would fight for political power. Yet, his beliefs did not gain unanimous support at the time. For example, Max Weber thought that economic conditions did not significantly shape people's political views. In his opinion, all political slogans had been born in the political sphere to "mirror" political interests of individuals, groups and/or classes. Figuratively speaking, Marx's and Weber's theories are at opposite ends of the scale: the former overrates the role of economic factors, whereas the latter underrates them.

Obviously, economic factors do not play the same role in all countries undergoing modernisation. The relationship between economic and political development also varies from country to country and from region to region. It is largely determined by a country's historical background and other key characteristics.

Research studies focusing on political aspects of modernisation underline that this process is aimed at raising effectiveness and efficiency of governance, rationalising the existing political system, as well as guaranteeing the right of every citizen to vote and to be elected — up to the top post. Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of political modernisation (unlike those of economic) do not considerably diverge. In fact, hardly anybody would be opposed to the idea of a democratic welfare state governed by the rule of law. But interpretations of this idea are vastly different — from clearly anarchistic to overtly totalitarian. In Russia, for instance, as in some other post-Soviet states, which pretend to be democratic, authoritarian rule blends together with "predatory" capitalism. Pervasive corruption, abuse of power and total neglect of ordinary citizens' needs are all too common in those countries, eventually turning democracy into its opposite.

Theoretical and methodological analysis of political processes (or political changes) oftentimes does not go beyond developing countries or transition economies, which undergo radical transformation of political institutions along with changes in the economic structure. However, Western world has also experienced both evolutionary and revolutionary transformations even recently, and this fact should not be overlooked. Such events as the establishment of the Fifth Republic in France (1958) and the restoration of democracy in Greece, which culminated with the proclamation of the Third Hellenic Republic, were revolutionary by nature and launched a new wave of political modernisation in those countries.

Democracies and semi-democracies may also collapse, and modernisation will "recede". This is quite typical of post-Soviet states, where a bizarre mix of progressive and regressive technologies has been introduced. Therefore, it makes sense to differentiate the concept "modernisation in a country" from "a modernising country". While the former assumes that modernisation is partial in a particular country, the latter puts emphasis on the country as a whole. Modernisation, in turn, can proceed through reforms or be accompanied by revolution.

Political modernisation does not necessarily go hand in hand with economic or sociocultural, and vice versa. Economic modernisation can also be carried out autonomously — as it has been the case with China. However, it does not mean

that every partial modernisation can be stopped. A host of things are contingent upon a shift in power within the ruling elite or random circumstances. The latter may also turn planned and purposeful modernisation into spontaneous and chaotic.

Modernisation is not an endless process, nor is it aimless. From a strategic standpoint, it is supposed to ensure stability of society, keep control of political dynamics. Yet, instability is an indispensable part of political development too, and it is not always negative. Political stability, on the other hand, can lead to stagnation. Then, the need for "instability" arises, and it is expected to produce effective changes.

Stability of a political system means steadiness, immutability at a certain stage of its development. Political transition, as part of the democratisation process, was comprehensively explained by Dankwart Rustow. He revised the political modernisation theory by giving a broader interpretation of modernisation, which was not limited to the transition from traditional to modern society. The scholar drew a distinction between "genetic" and "functional" approaches to studying political transformations, postulating that "the factors that keep a democracy stable may not be the ones that brought it into existence: explanations of democracy must distinguish between function and genesis" [Rustow, 1970: p. 346]. The "background condition" for democratisation is national unity [ibid. p. 350], the popular will to begin a democratic transition, whereas "the dynamic process of democratisation itself is set off by a prolonged and inclusive political struggle" [ibid. p. 352]. A lot of factors are involved in this process.

According to Rustow, there are three main phases of democratic transition:

1. Preparatory. The looming conflict between the main political forces and/or social groups is the hallmark of this phase.
2. Decision phase, which consists in seeking a compromise between the principal contending forces on "thorny" issues.
3. Habituation — new democratic institutions are being set up, while politicians and common citizens are being habituated to democratic rules [ibid. pp. 352–360].

In recent years, a fairly large number of social researchers have taken the position that modernisation processes are best analysed within the postmodern conceptual framework. But is this a well-thought-out argument or simply the willingness to keep up with the "latest fashion trends"? Key concepts of postmodern theories should be critically evaluated, especially when it comes to their methodological capacity. One of the upsides of postmodernism (in regard to social sciences) is that it does not stick to any ideology and, quite often, gives the impression of being more advanced. But postmodernist theories are lacking in precision and coherence; therefore, it is difficult to formulate any clear-cut conclusions using these theories.

Postmodernism, in a nutshell, denies the existence of any ultimate principles. Postmodernists reject scientific and technological rationalism claiming that it has already exhausted its potential, question the idea of objective reality and the concept of absolute truth believing that everything is subjective and relative. They also speak out against traditional morality. According to postmodernists, each person can develop a personal code of ethics without the need to follow tra-

ditional values and rules. In point of fact, postmodernism highlights "imperfections" in human reason and does not go further. Rationalism, by contrast, asserts that "the reasonable man" is accountable for his own actions in all areas of social life and looks at the problem of freedom and responsibility from a new standpoint.

As stated earlier, modernisation is mostly equated with transition from traditional to modern society, with a shift away from "backwardness" to "modernity". Samuel P. Huntington, for example, relies on the "Grand Process of Modernisation" to be a "bridge across the Great Dichotomy between" these two types of societies. Referring to other modernisation theorists (C. Black, R. Bendix, D. Lerner, etc.), Huntington delineates its nine core characteristics:

1. Modernisation is a *revolutionary* process, which involves a radical and total change in patterns of human life.
2. Modernisation is a *complex* process, which cannot be easily reduced to a single factor or dimension. It encompasses the entire society.
3. Modernisation is a *systemic* process. Changes in one factor are related to and affect changes in the other factors, finally leading to the systemic turn.
4. Modernisation is a *global* process. Originating in Europe, it has gradually become a worldwide phenomenon. All societies were at one time traditional; all societies are now either modern or in the process of becoming modern.
5. Modernisation is a *lengthy* process. Being revolutionary in the extent of the changes it brings about in traditional society, modernisation is evolutionary in the amount of time required to bring about those changes. The time needed to move from tradition to modernity will still be measured in generations.
6. Modernisation is a *phased* process. All modernising societies move through essentially the same stages. But the time when modernisation began and its patterns differ widely from one society to another.
7. Modernisation is a *homogenising* process — it produces tendencies toward convergence among societies. Many traditional societies that undergo modernisation are likely to share basic similarities.
8. Modernisation is an *irreversible* process. Although there may be temporary breakdowns and occasional reversals in elements of the modernising process, modernisation as a whole will be successfully accomplished.
9. Modernisation is a *progressive* process. The costs and the pains of the period of transition, particularly its early phases, are great, but the achievement of a modern social, political and economic order is worth them. Modernisation in the long run enhances human well-being, culturally and materially [Huntington, 1971: pp. 288–290].

It can be inferred from the passage that Huntington sees modernisation as a process that sweeps across the globe, thereby radically transforming societies — but, in the end, leads humanity to happiness. In general, one may agree with this statement. However, some of Huntington's arguments need to be critically evaluated.

First, it would be a mistake to look down on traditional societies. They are not that "primitive" and can definitely make a positive contribution to the global community. The same is true of traditional values. They are needed and can exist in modern society, though somewhat altered in form. Instead, forced modernisation accompanied by supplanting traditional values may result in destructive conflicts.

Second, there is a tendency to judge whether or not a society is "modern" from the West's point of view. Consequently, European and North American countries are regarded as the epitome of modernisation. Well, in that case, can Japanese society — that upholds centuries-old customs and traditions — be categorised as modern? Besides, many of those traditions facilitated Japan's modernisation.

Third, economic, political and sociocultural modernisation may not take place at the same time. They do not necessarily have the same tasks and purposes either. Modernisation does not always enhance the material and cultural well-being of all social strata. One more noteworthy aspect is that some of today's cultural or behavioural norms (which are considered "modern", and therefore should be adopted) may turn out to be completely inappropriate in many countries.

Fourth, modernisation theories oftentimes focus on economic aspects, not being applicable to political and sociocultural ones. Therefore, it is difficult to describe political and sociocultural modernisation compared to economic. But modernisation is a complex process, and that means it should be studied holistically.

Fifth, modernisation does not go smoothly in all countries. Many of them experience wars, revolutions, counter-revolutions, ethnic cleansing and genocide campaigns during the transition period. Hence, it is not correct to think of modernisation processes as the peak of social evolution.

Modernisation theories are subject to the same requirements as other social theories. This means that any theory, concept or paradigm will only be deemed successful if it can be put into practice and bring good results. And this is far more important than being recognised in their field. Marxism, for instance, was conceived of as a grandiose modernisation project — but it actually failed. Nevertheless, as a theory, Marxism was widely acknowledged. Today, the feasibility of Western modernisation theories can be tested in a number of countries. Yet, even economic modernisation may cause a lot of problems in any given country if its individual, regional, political and sociocultural specificity is overlooked or ignored. Modernisation processes are some of the most debatable topics nowadays. It is also arguable whether or not the Eurocentric modernisation project has been accomplished, whether or not we have moved from modernity to postmodernity, etc.

Modernisation projects can be divided into phases or span certain historical epochs. As previously mentioned, they involve radical changes in economy, politics and culture. Reorganisations and transformations affect individuals, small social groups and society as a whole; at the same time, they are expected to open up new prospects and provide new opportunities for a modernising society.

Modernisation models are multidimensional; therefore, they should take into account, as far as possible, changes in the character of social relations and so-

cial structures. The implementation of these models may engender new social controversies and conflicts or intensify existing ones. Consequently, there is an urgent need for "flexible", multiple factor models of modernisation, which will encompass historical background (first of all, national and civilisational specifics) of a country, along with examples of successful development of today's advanced societies.

Modernisation models are useful for explaining the interaction of factors conducive to evolutionary and revolutionary changes. Modernisation itself is seen as a preferable way of transforming society — since a "classic" image of revolution tends to frighten people. On the other hand, quite a few countries are presently witnessing conflicts, violence, dictatorial political regimes. Protest movements continue to emerge, and major structural changes are going to happen.

Revolution has not outlived its usefulness as a mean of resolving social conflicts. Revolutionary movements and revolutionary rhetoric have always been intrinsic to human civilisation. But the revolution itself has altered in form. Social conflicts, dissidence, mass protests and putsches are still present, but seem rather unlikely to bring about what is called "classic" revolution. Revolution is no longer considered inescapable — rather, it is a kind of social mutation that can occur in historically specific circumstances. Revolution is not a doctrine any more, nor is it reducible to slogans. Despite being different from what it used to be, revolution has not lost relevance to social, political, philosophical and cultural studies.

Combining methods used in sociological and political analysis, modernisation theory often proves helpful in describing complex transition processes. Today, numerous studies confirm that the global community is entering a post-industrial phase of social evolution characterised by growing economic cooperation and trade, scientific and technological breakthroughs, rapid development of telecommunications industry, global rise of education, etc.

Obviously, modernisation cannot follow the same pattern in all countries: alternative modernisation pathways can be offered. Nonetheless, there is a set of criteria that any country classified as modernising should meet — such as money economy, rise in government expenditure on education, the increasing role of science in policy issues (in the economic sphere), open stratification system allowing unlimited social mobility (in the social sphere), observance of human rights, political pluralism, consensus-based strategies for implementing administrative and managerial decisions (in politics).

Recognising the primacy of universal norms and requirements means that there is a "compulsory" programme for all developing countries, and they have to follow that programme. The universal criteria in terms of "modernity" include a set of goals that developing countries are trying to achieve. In so doing, they create political, economic and social structures able to respond quickly and effectively to current challenges. Yet, the pace, scope and character of modernisation, as well as means whereby necessary transformations are undertaken, depend on "capabilities" of a particular country, its historical background and national specificity; in other words, internal factors become decisive.

Speaking of developing countries, there is a conflict between modernisation goals defined at the national level (or requirements of the global political culture) and traditional, nationally specific values that those countries adhere to. Such a

conflict constitutes the principal contradiction of modernisation. Modernisation-related goals and values, penetrating the "mindset" of a particular country, can engender immense social problems and dysfunctions and put a considerable strain on governing structures and mechanisms. Hence, if the power structures are interested in successful implementation of modernisation reforms they must try their best to mitigate the risk of public discontent and outbursts in citizens' political behaviour — by searching for the way of "embedding" archaic sociocultural values into the logic of social transformations.

And again, national or cultural specificity should be dealt with in a gradual and consistent manner. Both ignoring a country's traditions and carrying out modernisation at a record pace will create enormous psychological pressure on people used to living in a traditional society. This may cause mass resentment and protests against modernisation reforms — even though the idea of modernisation itself is not opposed — and, further, destabilise society, as it was exemplified by Greece and some Eastern European countries.

Another serious obstacle to a country's modernisation is constituted by differentiation of roles within the political system, contradiction between the equity imperative (implying political participation of all citizens and fair access to resources) and the authorities' ability (or inability) to make society well-integrated. In this regard, governing structures should concentrate their efforts on using legitimate tools for managing conflicts, ensuring equality of all citizens before the law and being ready to resist political radicalism and terrorism.

An important conclusion of the modernisation theory is the thesis that this transition process takes place in two stages. At first, a country should carry out modernisation reforms relying on its own resources, then it will seek foreign support. However, modernising countries are often fraught with conflicts, both internal and external. Thus, if a country has already used up domestic resources and decides to apply for foreign assistance, not only foreign partners' interests but also (primarily) national security concerns must be taken into consideration.

Numerous conflicts accompanying modernisation processes, especially in the social and political sphere, effectively rule out the possibility of regulating social transformations in a peaceful manner. What is more, relatively short periods of liberalisation are often replaced by left- or right-wing dictatorships — like in Russia, where the Bolshevik dictatorship came after the era of Stolypin's policies or Italy, where Benito Mussolini's rise to power marked the end of Luigi Facta's liberal government. Thus, not only does institutionalisation of democratic norms and principles go problematically in modernising countries, but also the trend towards democratisation may be reversed.

The attempts to reform society in a modernising country are more likely to be successful if the governing elite and the opposition have agreed on the following issues: first, the attitude towards the society's past (no "witch-hunt"); second, reconciliation between the victors and the defeated; third, no arguments about former ruling parties and regimes. Furthermore, a set of provisional norms and rules for the key players in the political arena should be established — with observance of the principle of political freedom.

It will be easier for the governing elite and the opposition to come to an agreement on sociopolitical issues if they are able to run a coherent and constructive dialogue that would interest all sides and ready to seek compromise with their

opponents. However, this is not enough. The extent of social and ideological differentiation of society also matters a lot. A notable split over basic values, which is typical of countries like Russia, greatly complicates efforts to work out an acceptable compromise or poses a serious threat to the consensus that has already been achieved. Instead, the consensus reached among the main political forces will increase the social impact of reforms in political structures and institutions. This will bring lasting benefits to the society, such as the government's ability to successfully mobilise material and human resources in order to proceed with the reforms, stable governance structures and the widespread use of legal technologies for preparing and implementing administrative and managerial decisions.

In describing the development of transition systems, modernisation theory identifies several specific crises related to political actors' functions within the governing structure. These are: the identity crisis, the legitimacy crisis, the participation crisis, the penetration crisis and the distribution crisis [Coleman, Almond, 1960].

Джерела

Бакиров, В. С., Сазонов, Н. И. (Ред.), (2005). *Сравнительная политика. Основные политические системы современного мира*. Харьков: Харьковский национальный университет им. В. Н. Каразина.

Валлерстайн, И. (2001). *Анализ мировых систем и ситуация в современном мире*. Санкт-Петербург: Университетская книга.

Головаха, Е. И. (1996). *Трансформирующееся общество. Опыт социологического мониторинга в Украине*. Киев: Институт социологии НАН Украины.

Зарубина, Н. И. (1998). *Социокультурные факторы хозяйственного развития. М. Вебер и современные теории модернизации*. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Русского Христианского гуманитарного института.

Михальченко, М. І., Журавський, В. С., Танчер, В. В. (1997). *Соціально-політична трансформація України: реальність, міфологеми, проблеми вибору*. Київ: Логос.

Михальченко, Н. И. (2001). *Украинское общество: трансформация, модернизация или лимитроф Европы?* Киев: Институт социологии НАН Украины.

Норт, Д. (1997). *Институты, институциональные изменения и развитие экономики*. Москва: Фонд экономической книги "Начала".

Пилипенко, В. Е., Поддубный, В. А., Черненко, И. В. (1993). *Социальный морфогенез: эволюция и катастрофы (синергетический подход)*. Киев: Наукова думка.

Пилипенко, В. Є, Сапєлкіна, О. В., Чепурко, Г. І. (2016). *Модернізація: теорія, практика, цивілізаційний вимір*. Львів: Ліга-прес.

Пилипенко, В. Є., Чепурко, Г. І. (2017). *Соціальний діалог і трансформаційні зміни в Україні*. Львів: Ліга-прес.

Попова, И. М., Кунявский, М. Б. (1997). Социальная цена "запаздывающей" модернизации. *Социологический журнал,* 3, 20–37.

Рукавишников, В. О. (1995). Социологические аспекты модернизации России и других посткоммунистических обществ. *Социологические исследования,* 1, 34–46.

Ручка, А. А. (1994). Особенности системной трансформации современного украинского общества. *Современное общество,* 4, 6–15.

Хантингтон, С. Ф. (2004). *Политический порядок в меняющихся обществах*. Москва: Прогресс-традиция.

Ядов, В. А. (2003). Теоретическое осмысление трансформаций "посткоммунистических" стран в приложении к России. В А. Б. Гофман (Ред.), *Социология и современная Россия,* (сс. 4–52). Москва: Государственный университет "Высшая школа экономики".

Coleman, J., Almond, G. (Eds.), (1960). *The Politics of the Developing Areas.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ferrarotti, F. (1985). *The Myth of Inevitable Progress.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Huntington, S. P. (1971). The Change to Change: Modernisation, Development, and Politics. *Comparative Politics,* 3 (3), 283–322.

Inglehart, R., Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernisation, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marcuse, H. (2002). *One-Dimensional Man.* London: Routledge.

Rustow, D. A. (1970). Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model. *Comparative Politics,* 2(3), 337–363.

Матеріал одержано 20.05.2018

References

Bakirov, V. S., Sazonov, N. I. (Eds.)., (2005). *Comparative Politics. The Main Types of Political Systems in Today's World.* [In Russian]. Kharkiv: V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. [= Бакиров 2005]

Coleman, J., Almond, G. (Eds.), (1960). *The Politics of the Developing Areas.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ferrarotti, F. (1985). *The Myth of Inevitable Progress.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Golovakha, Ye. I. (1996). *A Transforming Society. The Experience of Undertaking a Monitoring Social Survey in Ukraine.* [In Russian]. Kyiv: Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. [= Головаха 1996]

Huntington, S. P. (1971). The Change to Change: Modernisation, Development, and Politics. *Comparative Politics,* 3 (3), 283–322.

Huntington, S. P. (2004). *Political Order in Changing Societies.* [In Russian]. Moscow: Progress-Tradition. [= Хантингтон 2004]

Inglehart, R., Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernisation, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marcuse, H. (2002). *One-Dimensional Man.* London: Routledge.

Mikhal'chenko, N. I. (2001). *Ukrainian Society: Transformation, Modernisation, or a European Limitrophe State?* [In Russian]. Kyiv: Institute of Sociology of the NAS of Ukraine. [= Михальченко 2001]

Mykhal'chenko, M. I., Zhuravs'kyi, V. S., Tancher, V. V. (1997). *Sociopolitical Transformation of Ukraine: Reality, Mythologems, and the Problem of Choice.* [In Ukrainian]. Kyiv: Logos. [= Михальченко 1997]

North, D. (1997). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance.* [In Russian]. Moscow: "Origins" Economics Books Foundation. [= Норт 1997]

Pilipenko, V. Ye., Poddubnyi, V. A., Chernenko, I. V. (1993). *Social Morphogenesis: Evolution and Catastrophes (A Synergistic Approach).* [In Russian]. Kyiv: Scientific Thought. [= Пилипенко 1993]

Popova, I. M., Kuniavskii, M. B. (1997). The Cost of "Belated" Modernisation to Society. [In Russian]. *Sociological Journal,* 3, 20–37. [= Попова 1997]

Pylypenko, V. Ye., Sapielkina, O. V., Chepurko, G. I. (2016). *Modernisation: Theory, Practice, Civilisational Dimension.* [In Ukrainian]. L'viv: League Press. [= Пилипенко 2016]

Pylypenko, V. Ye., Chepurko, G. I. (2017). *Social Dialogue and Transformational Changes in Ukraine*. [In Ukrainian]. L'viv: League Press. [= Пилипенко 2017]

Ruchka, A. A. (1994). Specific Features of Systemic Transformation of the Present-Day Ukrainian Society. [In Russian]. *Present-Day Society,* 4, 6–15. [= Ручка 1994]

Rukavishnikov, V. O. (1995). Sociological Aspects of Modernisation for Russia and Other Post-Communist Societies. [In Russian]. *Sociological Studies,* 1, 34–46. [= Рукавишников 1995]

Rustow, D. A. (1970). Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model. *Comparative Politics,* 2(3), 337–363.

Wallerstein, I. (2001). *World Systems Analysis and the Current World Situation*. [In Russian]. Saint Petersburg: University Book Press. [= Валлерстайн 2001]

Yadov, V. A. (2003). Theoretical Comprehension of "Post-Communist" Countries' Transformations as Applied to Russia. [In Russian]. In A. B. Gofman (Ed.), *Sociology and Present-Day Russia,* (pp. 4–52). Moscow: The State University "Higher School of Economics". [= Ядов 2003]

Zarubina, N. I. (1998). *Sociocultural Factors of Economic Development. M. Weber and Contemporary Modernisation Theories.* [In Russian]. Saint Petersburg: Russian Christian Institute of the Humanities Press. [= Зарубина 1998]

Received 20.05.2018

Translated by
Ol'ha Maksymenko