

**Tetyana POYARKOVA<sup>1</sup>**

## **CRISIS SYNDROME OF MODERNIZATION: UKRAINIAN VARIANT**

In this article the evolution of “crisis syndrome of modernization” concept is observed. The reasons of divergent understanding of modernization crises in Western and domestic political sciences are analyzed. In the article the necessity of the renewal of the notion «crisis syndrome of modernization» is grounded. The author proposes personal version of “crisis syndrome of modernization” which lets to distinguish crises – reasons for modernization and crises which occur as its result. Advantages of the proposed version of crisis syndrome of modernization are in possibilities 1) to fix the gradation of formation and development of system inconsistencies; 2) to take into consideration that multiplicity of political crises may be predetermined by the current scenario and also by unsolved problems of previous modernization projects. In this context, success criteria of Ukrainian modernization are changes in political consciousness because of activation of Ukrainian people self-organization, formation of national identification on the basis of moral and value consolidation of society, which in general lead to collective self-determination and creation of collective subject of political process. Unlike modern official opinion, which insists that modernization has taken place in Ukraine (in the form of “optimization” and “improvement”), we think that the last twenty years are defined by development of simplification scenario. This means, that several unsuccessful attempts of modernization in Ukraine have determined simultaneousness of multidirectional phenomena: degradation of industrial achievements, archaisation – as return to the most viable system forms on the background of adoption of certain features of modern information society. In such coordinates crisis syndrome of modernization is not an episode in life of political system but gradual process, where qualitative manifestations and degree of political system damage depend on authorities’ activity, social conditions, demographic resources of certain political system and behavior of geopolitical environment.

**Keywords:** oligarchization, modernization, crisis syndrome of modernization, Ukraine.

“Crisis syndrome of modernization” concept (which combines interconnected crises of penetration, participation, identity, legitimacy and distribution) was introduced to scientific use by composite work “Crises and Sequences in Political Development” (1971) ed. by L. Binder<sup>2</sup>. This seventh volume in series on political development sponsored the Committee on Comparative of politics of the Social Science Research Council – has never been republished and was fiercely critical just after the appearance. The notion “crisis syndrome of modernization” itself belongs to marginal in Western political science in contrast with the post-Soviet science, where it gained scientific ground and popularity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr Tetyana K. Poyarkova, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Ukraine, Kiev, Department of Political Science, Institute of Political Science and Law, e-mail:rosin13@ukr.net

<sup>2</sup> Crises and Sequences in Political Development. Ed. By L. Binder. Princeton 1971.

# 1. SPECIAL ASPECTS OF “CRISIS SYNDROME OF MODERNIZATION” CONCEPT APPEARANCE AND EVOLUTION

It is remarkable that “crisis syndrome of modernization” concept appeared as a compilation of problem aspects of modernization, singled out by each author of the publication on the basis of their own research topics and objectives. For example, L. Binder in his part “The Crises of Political Development” substantiated the necessity of expansion of the meaning of “modernization” concept, for this purpose he indicated “dependent” and “independent conditions of modernization”<sup>3</sup>. L. Binder connected modernization with unavoidable difficulties in spheres of: 1) identity (religious, ethnic, citizenship); 2) legitimacy (as an immanent resource of political system); 3) political participation of the elite and the masses; 4) separation between status and privileges; 5) management control; 6) grade of administrative embrace and legal expansion.

J. Coleman considered modernization as a process which (due to its compliance with imperative to reach political equity) promotes structural differentiation and increases system adaptation potential which means it (by definition) cannot be homotypic and conform to common rules<sup>4</sup>.

L. Pye focused on modernization as a search of balance by political system between opposite vectors of development – integration and universalization<sup>5</sup>. At this point of view, the basic problem of modernization to his mind was a conflict between political culture that stabilizes political system and ideological changes which justify the government. Crises (of identity and legitimacy) acquired the status of natural phenomena caused by the increase of political participation and also by emergence of different types of political behavior.

M. Weiner in his research of political participation as a cause and a consequence of political process crisis singled out several conditions on which the expansion of political participation assists modernization: activity, freedom of political demands articulation, voluntariness, legislative formation of rules of political elite selection<sup>6</sup>. Political participation generates crises only in case if it ruins the institutionalization of changes.

J. LaPalombara indicated that the success of modernization depends not only upon the peculiarities of separate political system but also upon its geographical position<sup>7</sup>. In his work he positioned the penetration crisis as the peak of accumulation of problems catalyzed by ambiguous character of changes, which on the one hand lead to

<sup>3</sup> L. Binder, *The Crises of Political Development* in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences in Political Development*, Princeton 1971, pp. 3-72.

<sup>4</sup> J. S. Coleman, *The Development Syndrome: Differentiation – Equality – Capacity* in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and sequences in political development*, Princeton 1971, pp. 73-100.

<sup>5</sup> L. Pye, *Identity and the Political Culture*, in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences of Political Development*, Princeton 1971, pp. 101-135; L. Pye, *The Legitimacy Crisis*, in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences of Political Development*, Princeton 1971, pp. 136-158.

<sup>6</sup> M. Weiner, *Political Participation: Crisis of the Political Process*, in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences of Political Development*, Princeton 1971, pp. 159-204.

<sup>7</sup> J. LaPalombara, *Penetration: A Crisis of Governmental Capacity*, in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences of Political Development*, Princeton 1971, pp. 205-282.

democratization, but on the other hand they mark transfer to the new production relations and change of basic values.

In the final chapter S. Verba presents to discuss problem areas, reserving crisis for a problem in the area which requires institution innovation for a government to handle it:

- penetration “how much effective control the central government has”
- participation “who takes part (who has influence over) the making of governmental decision”
- legitimacy “the basis on which and the degree to the decisions of government are accept by the populace of the society”
- distribution “the extent to which the decisions of government are used to distribute material benefits and other benefits in the society”
- identity “the set of individuals whom it is believed appropriately fall within the decision making scope of the government, ... the appropriate members of the system”<sup>8</sup>.

It is a paradox but the success rate of “crisis syndrome of modernization” concept was seriously doubted in the introductory chapter by L. Binder and also in the final chapter by S. Verba. So, S. Verba supposed that given conception had a weak point – it was unable to separate difficulties from problems of modernization (“some ambiguity as to what exactly the crises or problems are. In part, the issue is whether they are crises (some special kind of event that comes and goes) or persistent problems that political system face. And, whichever conception of the item is used, they are difficult to place in a sequence because the five items seem to come together”)<sup>9</sup>.

But in general, S. Verba supposed, it was a good idea to present modernization process difficulties by means of crises diagram, because terms of modernization in every separate case may vary, but the general sense of this process remains. For example, “what Britain took centuries to do – solve the problem of identity, legitimacy, participation and distribution – the new nations have to do in the briefest span of time”<sup>10</sup>.

It must be added that hypothesis concerning crises of modernization was proposed on the basis of materials of independent researches, carried out by separated authors not connected by the unified scale of research of similar processes, common territory and time limits. Also the question, whether modernization is the cause of crises or it only intensifies the existing problems, was not decided. It was not also decided the dependence of crises on modernization quality – “primary” or “secondary”.

Therefore neither political crisis nor the number of crises were not the object of research, methods for research of the variety of interconnected crises were not represented also – i.e. “neither the crises, nor the sequences, nor the connection among them, have been reliably identified”<sup>11</sup>.

It cannot be denied that statement of the question about inevitable consequences of modernization in the form of political difficulties, which evolve into crises, undermined the grounds of modernization theory that was based on the concept that modernization is a

<sup>8</sup> S. Verba, *Sequences and Development*, in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences of Political Development*, Princeton 1971, p. 299

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. p. 297.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. p. 314.

<sup>11</sup> C. Tilly, *Western State-Making and Theories of Political Transformation*, in *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*, Princeton 1975, Ch. IX, p. 611.

positive uniform process, where economic market changes assist the acceleration of Western democratic values.

In this context, the opinion of R. Grew seems fair. It says that the metaphors and syndromes of modernization became the sort of intellectual fad to which the social sciences, in their eagerness to prove themselves a science, are particularly subject. While some worried about clean definitions, usable models, and testable hypotheses, the subject was swamped as everyone attached his study to the term (with historians generally arriving last and loosest).

It is necessary to point out that scientific society immediately took steps to remedy the situation with crises research of political systems in transformation stage. So, G. Almond in composite work "Crisis, Choice, and Change: Historical Studies of Political Development" (1973) indicated the necessity of creation of interdisciplinary approach which would enable the research of crisis phenomena in spatiotemporal dimension. This would make possible to take into account: 1) peculiarities of transfer from one state of political system to the other; 2) actions of subjects of political process<sup>12</sup>.

S. Flanagan (in the same work) proposed to make phase-by-phase research of political crises<sup>13</sup>. So, at the first phase it was necessary to focus on the resources, which system provides to overcome the crisis phenomena and at the second phase – on consideration of internal and external factors of the system, where internal conditions of the system depend on the activity of separate politicians, citizens, formed expectations and they change under external influence (international politics, economic events, ecology, etc. At the third phase of crisis analysis attention should be paid to the asymmetry between demands towards the system and abilities of the system to react properly. New relations between socium and authorities are the research object at the fourth phase.

J. Habermas in his work "Legitimation Crisis" (1973) proposed to focus crisis analysis on connection between system integration and social integration, where system integration is a frame, where political instruments are the subject of social relations and social integration frame embraces their symbolic structurization: "We speak of social integration in relation to the systems of institutions in which speaking and acting subjects are socially related... Social systems are seen here as life-worlds that are symbolically structured. We speak of system integration with a view to the specific steering performances of a self-regulated system. Social systems are considered here from the point of view of their capacity to maintain their boundaries and their continued existence by mastering the complexity of an inconstant environment. Both paradigms, life-world and system, are important. The problem is to demonstrate their interconnection"<sup>14</sup>.

Lack of adequate instruments and methods of the analysis of these relations led J. Habermas to the conclusion that it is necessary to decide the universal properties of system organization, namely: 1) production (as development of external nature) and socialization (as development of internal nature); 2) changes in goal values of systems – state functions and grade of system autonomy; 3) state-of-the-art – ability to solve problems institutionally.

<sup>12</sup> G.A. Almond, *Approaches to Developmental Causation in Crisis, Choice, and Change: Historical Studies of Political Development*, Boston 1973, pp. 1-41.

<sup>13</sup> S.C. Flanagan, *Modes and Methods of Analysis*, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-102.

<sup>14</sup> J. Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis*, London 1973, p. 4.

In this frames crisis process acquires a form of gradual growth of interdependent symptoms. The essence of crisis process is discovered by means of indication of principal differences between crises of traditional and modernized society. So, in traditional system, crises emerge when problems cannot be solved within the bounds of existing political area which is limited by organization principles<sup>15</sup>.

Crises become an integral line in capitalist liberal systems: democracy as political practice demands safety of lifeworld entirety, but capitalism demands legitimization of public operation mode and private appropriation of the excesses.

Further evolution of the “crisis syndrome of modernization” concept provides evidence of emergence of duality. On the one side, there is a predominance of the interdependent crises variant, on the other side, there is a gradual transformation influenced by changes of more common conceptions: “modernization” and “political crisis”.

In this way, progressive expansion of “modernization” concept: from a notion of transfer process from agrarian to industrial society – to high economic standards orientation, enabled to use “modernization” term for description of globalization, post-industrialization, deindustrialization (vivid example is a “negative modernization” concept used for soviet modernization experience<sup>16</sup>). Deviation from the western type of modernization as the only one orienting point has become generally accepted and affirmation of variety of modernization ways (for example USA, Chinese, European countries modernization) has received scientific recognition<sup>17</sup>.

Globalization as a process of establishment of holistic management structure with global division of labor, with existence of efficient institution of international regulating authorities, which oppose to the states which lose their independence features, is destructive for “modernization” concept. Here modernization becomes strategic weapon, which covers redistribution of public resources in favor of global players<sup>18</sup>.

Changes have also touched “political crisis” concept, which is treated in increasing frequency as something bigger than a system breakpoint. More and more proofs has got the hypothesis that political crisis is a system phenomenon by its nature which can have multiple demonstrations. Therefore the research must focus on finding of deep connections between crisis phenomena of different parts of political system, i.e. inside the system (resources condition) and also the connections with the environment<sup>19</sup>.

These transformations in some way promoted the evolution of the “crisis syndrome of modernization” concept that has a tendency to deny crisis phenomena of modernization being only a schematic set of crises – to finding of certain reasons catalyzing crisis phenomena in separate political system. Several points of view on the nature, reasons and special development characteristics of crises of modernized systems can be marked out.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. p. 20-21.

<sup>16</sup> D. Trubitsyn, «Modernizatsiya» i «negativnaya mobilizatsiya»: konstrukty i sushchnost, Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. 2010. No 5. s. 6.

<sup>17</sup> E. Kulpin-Gubaydullin, *Aternativy rossiyskoy modernizatsii ili restavratsiya Meidzi po-russki*, Polis. 2009. No 5. s. 158-169.

<sup>18</sup> N. Kliayn, *Doktrina shoka*. Moskva 2009. s. 3.

<sup>19</sup> D. Armand, D. Liuri, V. Zherihin, *Aanatomya krizisov*, Moskva 1999.

[www.prometeus.nsc.ru/contents/books/crisis.ssi](http://www.prometeus.nsc.ru/contents/books/crisis.ssi)

The first group comprises scientific research results where modernization crises are connected with the feature of capitalism to transfer its problems in space (to other regions and countries) and in time (to the next generations). In this context demonstrations of crises directly depend on location of the country and hierarchy of modern capitalist world. Here acts the rule: the closer to the center (core), the more possibilities there are to overcome crises, and vice versa, the closer to the rimland, the less resources are available to come out of crisis. Variation of this point of view is that modern crises are the sequence of new partition of the world where the key point is technological supremacy, which leads to erosion of western liberal democracy ideal<sup>20</sup>.

The second group includes the attempts to explain the crises of modernization of separate political systems by their inner peculiarities. Here crises syndrome of modernization is grounded on change of essence of state during modernization transformations<sup>21</sup>.

The third group defines crisis syndrome of modernization as an abundance of interacting crises, dependent on characteristics of the political system itself and also on the behavior of surrounding political environment<sup>22</sup>.

In native political science, popularity of modernization theory researches is partially explained by rapid wrecking of Soviet scientific pyramid in 1990s of XX AD, when due to the absence of serious scientific expertise and methodological proofs, the absorption of conceptions of western political point of view took place<sup>23</sup>.

This led post-Soviet transformations to be dealt with from the point of view of their accordance to a certain ideal, rarely – taking into account their dependence on quality of the transformed system. This deviation in points of view led to diversity in understanding of nature of crises phenomena.

So, the first approach is characterized by making an accent on system modernization by means of: 1) creation of modern competitive state with the rule of law, advanced legal culture, balanced representative democracy, effective self-government, mobile state management; 2) introduction of partner relationship between the state and the business in process of national projects realization<sup>24</sup>.

In this context, success criteria of Ukrainian modernization are changes in political consciousness because of activation of Ukrainian people self-organization, formation of national identification on the basis of moral and value consolidation of society, which in general lead to collective self-determination and creation of collective subject of political process<sup>25</sup>. “Crisis syndrome of modernization” at this point of view is analyzed as a

---

<sup>20</sup> A. Vadzra, *Put zla. Zapad: matritsaglobalnoy gegemonii*, Moskva 2007, s. 273.

<sup>21</sup> A. Bard, Y. Zoderkvist, *Netokratiya. Novaya praviashchaya elita i zhizn posle kapitalizma*, Sankt-Peterburg 2004, s. 61-83.

<sup>22</sup> P. Kennedy, *Vstupaya v dvadtsat pervyi vek: monografiya*, Moskva 1997, s. 274, 278.

<sup>23</sup> L. Poliakov, *Metodologiya issledovaniya rossiyskoy modernizatsii*, Polis, 1997, No 3, s. 6.

<sup>24</sup> M. Rozumnyi, O. Kornievkiy, V. Yablonskiy, *Ukrayina: politychni strategiyi modernizatsiyi*, Kyiv 2011, s. 7, 42.

<sup>25</sup> XXI stolittya. Strategiya reform i suspilnoyi konsolidatsiyi: Ekspertna dopovid Natsionalnogo instytutu strategichnyh doslidzhen do poslannya Prezydenta Ujrayiny V. Yanukovycha do Ukrayinskogo narodu [http://www.niss.gov.ua/public/File/2010\\_Book/Poslanya\\_2010/ukr.pdf](http://www.niss.gov.ua/public/File/2010_Book/Poslanya_2010/ukr.pdf)

display of inequality of the grade of separate institutes, political structures and civilized standards<sup>26</sup>.

At the same time, there is a viewpoint that assessment of Ukrainian modernization from the empiric-descriptive approach is not perspective, because “handling of abstract notions does not allow to describe and treat the existing realities properly”<sup>27</sup>. Here the causes of occurrence of “crisis syndrome of modernization” are seen in disagreements between the aims of modernization and people opinion about it; in increase of quantity of political subjects; in empowerment of local authorities; in citizens’ orientation to regional and national norms and traditions<sup>28</sup>.

But all these approaches leave behind one important circumstance that Ukrainian political system has been modernized several times. This fact makes actual the development of new theoretical version of crisis syndrome of modernization: taking into account avoiding of unidimensional understanding of modernization and possibility to represent peculiarities of the modernized system.

## 2. CRISIS SYNDROME OF MODERNIZATION – NEW VERSION

To solve assigned task, the defining of most general parameters of functionality/disfunctionality of political system is needed. In this context, it is relevant to mention the remark of E. Yudin, that for the research of object functionality it is enough to focus on connections inside the object and also outside it – on its connections with the environment<sup>29</sup>. Methodological advantage of such approach is that it shows what often remains beyond the scope of scientific researches – priority of object connections against its structure.

The key type of connections become communications, which appear at the moment, when certain signals of the element become the input coordinates, which change the state of the element. In this case “input” information (that passes to the element) has a form of a “message”, and significant information, that can change the state of the element, is a reflection of this message by the element itself. Therefore, connection is a complicated type of communication, when output signals of one element become input signals of the other and its own output signals become input signals of the third and so on<sup>30</sup>.

On the basis of mentioned above, let’s try to propose our own version of crisis syndrome of modernization research. In our opinion, internal state of the system can be evaluated on the basis of socium coherence (with its latent evaluation – expectations), which criterion is mobilization potential of various social layers. Existence of social groups is important either – generators of ideas of system changes. Often the messenger of

<sup>26</sup> O. Balatska Politychna elita v Ukraini v protsesi demokratychnoyi modernizatsiyi, Grani, 2010, No1 (69), s. 132-136.

<sup>27</sup> Y. Levenets, *Politychna systema suchasnoyi Ukrainy – kategorialnyi analiz*, Suchasna ukrayinska polityka. Polityky i politology pro neyi, 2009, Vyp. 17, s. 8-10 c. 8

<sup>28</sup> V. Kholod, *Politychna modernizatsiya: z gustok protyrich*, Politychnyi menedzhment, 2006, No 5, s. 33-44.

<sup>29</sup> E. Yudin, *Sistemnyi pohod i printsip deyatelnosti. Metodologicheskie problemy nauki*, Moskva 1978, s. 239.

<sup>30</sup> M. Grachev, *Politicheskaya kommunikatsiya*, Vestnik Rossiyskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Politologiya, 1999, No 1, s. 24-25.

transformation necessity is the existence of social categories, which have lost their belonging to certain social stratum but they remain influence on the whole society.

Other parameters of internal conditions of political system may be qualitative characteristics of political elite, namely: 1) existence of groups – pretenders for political power, who are interested in modernization as a mean of legitimation of their pretenses for power; 2) functional substitution of political elite by other layers (for example bureaucracy).

The next parameter is condition of infrastructure channels between socium and authorities that embraces communications between different social layers and ways of incorporation of society members into the authorities (for example education, military service, etc.). Unlike the foregoing (horizontal changes), this one is vertical, covering communication channels between authorities and society, and it gives evidence to readiness for common actions of socium and elite, i.e. it is a background for generation of social energy and a guarantee of its orientation according to system requirements. In other words, political infrastructure is a connection between the authorities and socium, which provides the existence of political system as a unity.

It is important that in traditional society cooperation channels between political elite and different social layers are defined by place in political hierarchy and they have limitations in favor of authorities. At the same time, it is wrong to deny the existence of social lifts (for incorporation to higher social layers) for the most active society members on the basis of wealth, military valor, scientific knowledge, services or even adventurism. In this case, system rocking begins with two polar processes: ossification of hierarchy and absence of any possibility to lift on social ladder, or to have another way to get higher social status bypassing the existing hierarchy.

In contrast with traditional society – industrial society survives due to developed infrastructure, where education becomes a ground of social status. Here it is possible to diagnose problems by means of lining up a hierarchy of admittance to authorities on different conditions (closeness to VIPs, mass media control, etc.), but the key symptom is loss of social status of education.

So, general characteristic of insufficiency of infrastructure connectivity is loss of controllability and inadequate reactions on system challenges – from the veil of silence to wishful thinking. Important things here are: orientation of communication infrastructure (from political elite to socium and vice versa); existence of lifts for incorporation of representatives of different social layers into political elite.

In case of disruption of communication infrastructure, it is necessary to take into account the way of filling of its gaps: what social formations begin to functionally substitute it. It is significant that in this case surrogate-substitutes are created in the form of: 1) criminalization, which, as a matter of fact, is a channel beyond the legal framework and is not regulated by the state; 2) formation of social structures (mainly private), which become “substitutes” of the state; 3) increase of influence of bureaucracy and officialism; 4) appearance of social structures like “clans”, “families”, which concentrate control over certain fields of activity; 5) emergence of “shadow” socium<sup>31</sup>.

One more sign of functionality loss by political system is increased influence on political system by geopolitical environment. This thesis seems illogical at the first sight

---

<sup>31</sup> A. Stoliarov, *Osvobozhdennyi Edem*, Moskva-Sankt-Peterburg 2008, s. 229, 237-238, 241, 265.



because the more possibilities has got the political system to treat the incoming data, the more impulses it gets and the more adequate will be the reaction of this system. But in this case, effective rule is that the more political system is alike the environment, the easier it is to conquer it. If conductibility of input channels is less than critical, then the system will inevitably degenerate due to its inability to see problems and to find proper decisions in time.

As a result, environmental factor becomes an external parameter, which embraces geopolitical interests of political systems, and these interests can accelerate or retard modernization processes of certain political system depending on their own strategic intentions. Influence methods are very diverse: from creation of attractive images of modernity in the form of technological, cultural, status orients for inheritance – to military peril.

On our opinion, crisis phenomena, which emerge as a sequence of unsuccessful modernization, can be represented in the form of the most probable variants of political system behavior – scenarios. Main scenarios of failed modernization are cases when system degrades, or freezes, unable to develop, or dies instead of “updating”.

Choice and development peculiarities of one or another scenario will depend on resource basis of political system. (In general, everything valuable for political system survival belongs to the resources of political system, but in any case the condition of demographic resource is the most meaningful).

Scenario of political system transfer to a lower organization level – it is its simplification in the form of: 1) destruction of excessive structureness, release of social energy for search of innovation decisions; 2) degradation of institutional form.

Modernization may become a cause of political system “freezing” too. In this case political system exists till it has energies for self-reproduction. Gradual impoverishment of all kinds of system reactions, complicity of decision making, decrease of ability to foresee the consequences of certain actions of authorities are indicative for this process. But system can overcome crisis condition by means of problems transference in time (to the future) and in space (to other territories). Here impenetrability of political elite becomes an accompanying factor that makes itself evident in the fact that authorities distance themselves from socium, and in this way they cover their impotence.

Death of political system is the most negative scenario of crisis syndrome of modernization, which leads to inevitable “reformatting” with subsequent depletion of all kinds of resources.

Advantages of the proposed version of crisis syndrome of modernization are in possibilities 1) to fix the gradation of formation and development of system inconsistencies; 2) to take into consideration that crises belong to phenomena with hidden (latent) phase. In such coordinates, crisis syndrome of modernization is not an episode in life of political system, but gradual process, where qualitative manifestations and degree of political system damage depend on authorities’ activity, resource basis of certain political system, behavior of geopolitical environment.

But that is not all: as far as crisis syndrome of modernization covers phenomena in space-and-time perspective, political system manages to create a certain stereotype for overcoming of modernization consequences, which “starts up” every time modernization does not gain the desired objective.

### 3. CRISIS SYNDROME OF MODERNIZATION OF UKRAINIAN POLITICAL SYSTEM

Research of crisis syndrome of modernization in Ukraine nowadays demands first of all taking into account the inertia from previous unsuccessful attempts of modernization. Second of all, it is necessary to specify the type of scenario, that has emerged as a result of previous unsuccessful modernizations and that holds the system hostage. Thirdly, singling out of regularities of deployment of crisis syndrome of modernization scenario will enable the appearance of propositions concerning methods to overcome it.

This means that it is necessary to create modernization “matrix” of previous attempts for understanding of logic of up-to-date modernization in Ukraine. From this point of view, it is worthwhile to single out peculiarities of Russian and Soviet political systems modernization.

So, the first wave (reforms and counter-reforms of Russian Emperors Alexander II, Alexander III, Nicholas II) was a reaction on geopolitical defeat in the Crimean War; was used by dominant social layer for legitimation; was fulfilled by strongarm methods. Basic resource for modernization was demographic redundancy of peasant class, that led to disruption of connection between authorities and *socium*, and to substitution of communication channels by bureaucracy and adventurists, and also it led to social disruptions (between professional and seasonal workers; bondslaves and state peasants).

Main result was emergence of social layer – quasiintelligentsia – intellectuals – people of humble parentage, which were unable to make living with the help of knowledge<sup>32</sup>. Marginality of pseudointelligentsia had transformed it into main storage of radical transformations adherents, that finally caused the development of the most negative scenario – wreck of the system.

The second modernization wave included Stalin project of collectivization and industrialization with their peculiar properties: 1) usage of modernization idea for elimination of political opponents; 2) violence; 3) existence of one-way communication infrastructure – from authorities to people, where change of social status became possible on the basis of education or joining the communist party; 4) usage of external threat as a mean of formation of a new connectivity of *socium*.

Peasant class again became a resource for modernization. Quasiintelligentsia found itself in good position because it had lost all social competitors (different types of intelligentsia) due to repressions and became a ground of a new privileged layer.

Crisis syndrome of modernization of that period is institutional “simplification” of the system (its reduction to blocks: political government, party apparatus and executives). Each of these blocks had its own hierarchy, where a higher-level authority governed a lower-level one and a lower-level authority had only an executive function towards the higher-level one. *Socium* had been simplified either: instead of social variety there were only Soviet people. System had got another chance for survival due to this factor, which helped it to withstand during WWII and within a short time to become a leading geopolitical player by means of creation of a barrier with allied countries around the system.

The next try of modernization – “The Thaw” of N. Khrushchev – was a reaction on the Cold War. But updating was necessitated also by the fact, that *socium* during the WWII

---

<sup>32</sup> R. Daniels, *Vzlet i padenie kommunizma v Rossii*, Moskva 2011, s. 68.

had received new connectivity (beyond ideology). Confounding factor was the depletion of human resources after the WWII, that explained putting a stake on young adults and their enthusiasm (for example in wildlands development).

Also cannot be denied the existence of subjective component – necessity to bench the most probable heritors of I. Stalin. This explains another peculiarity of this wave – competition for support of party nomenclature and Soviet officials.

The results were controversial. On the one hand, disclosure of historic truth caused the emergence of different subcultures (dissident, intellectual, business). On the other hand, plans of wide technological system renewal were substituted by concentration on specific targets (outer space exploration). Depletion of resources passed gradually, but first of all it showed up on geopolitical level. In these circumstances loss of the central control on outer level led to immediate attempts of satellite states to get rid of the USSR overprotection.

Crisis syndrome of modernization reflected in “freezing” of political system scenario, which showed up in preservation of economic underdevelopment, predomination of patriarchal relations and specific cultural properties: necessity in control, feeling of gratitude towards authorities, conformism. Social inequality became a condition of survival, where loyal to authority intelligentsia got the privileged position, and political elite became an impenetrable social phenomenon.

The next try of modernization – “perestroika” – was caused by competition between representatives of different generations of the authorities’ head on the background of interest of geopolitical subjects in the USSR downswing. Top echelons of power were initiators of the system update. The reform itself meant mobilization of critical spirits and intelligentsia enthusiasm for search of a new social connectivity by means of apprehension of historical past. Part of party-and-state nomenclature, part of intelligentsia and socrum expectations of quick changes were the main resource.

Crisis syndrome of modernization in “perestroika” is a scenario of “catastrophic” simplification of the system: 1) losing by intelligentsia its privileged status and transformation into marginal layer; 2) dismounting of Soviet social connectivity and swift social stratification; 3) rollback of state control spheres; 4) losing of influence in geopolitical environment. Local peripheral elite had the game in hands, because it consolidated for reaping a benefit during power redistribution process among center and republics.

On the basis of research of several modernization projects (Russian Empire, industrialization in USSR, Khrushchev Thaw and perestroika) their common features can be singled out: 1) fulfillment on behalf of the ruling class; 2) existence of state control; 3) absence of clear idea about the purpose of system modernization. Inevitable consequences were disruptions in social tissue and acquisition by political elite such features, which were alien to its own political system. The most frequent scenarios became simplification and freezing of political system.

This position allows to assent to the opinion of L. Baltserovich, that only political system characteristics (experience of past modernizations on the background of demographic resource depletion) and not “unusual cultural characteristics” are the reasons of striking difference between Polish shock therapy and Soviet perestroika<sup>33</sup>.

---

<sup>33</sup> L. Baltserovich, *Svoboda I rozvytok. Ekonomiya vilnogo rynku*, Lviv 2000, s. 222.

Unlike modern official opinion, which insists that modernization has taken place in Ukraine (in the form of “optimization” and “improvement”), we think that the last twenty years are defined by development of simplification scenario. This means, that several unsuccessful attempts of modernization in Ukraine have determined simultaneousness of multidirectional phenomena: degradation of industrial achievements, archaisation – as return to the most viable system forms on the background of adoption of certain features of modern information society.

On our opinion, main display of this scenario is formation of a new elite layer on the basis of Soviet nomenclature class, where the ground for unity is admission to state property redistribution and acquisition of state aids for business, under the influence of different processes, namely – degradation and archaisation (initiation of groups of people into politics, which were united on the basis of preindustrial grounds – common territory and personal loyalty).

This scenario is characterized also by maximum impoverishment of people’s capital with domination of consumer type of connectivity, specified by social fragmentation, decrease of interest to social life, substitution of social horizon by personal one, blur and internal contrariety of public opinion that testifies the absence of fundamental realizing of current situation.

Simplification of political infrastructure has got the shape of unilateralism and lack of channels for incorporation of social elements to political elite, because education is not a ground for career progress under conditions of social polarization. Therefore, system-forming factor of political system existence (interdependence of elite and society) comes to ruin.

At the same time, it is necessary to take into account that the present is a point of system excessive simplification which in our conditions gets the features of oligarchization of political system. On our opinion, basic marks of the fact, that the system now is passing this border, is concentration of power within the circle of close to the “family” people, and political opponent immediately becomes an “enemy” of the present authority.

“Neosoviet” methods become means for maintenance in power: business permissions and state aids for close circle of people, excessive control over all the rest economic players. Under such conditions, a process of estrangement of political elite takes place – as a demonstration of “ossification” of oligarchy regime, which is a ground for increase of political system vulnerability through situationality of political activity, because it testifies for lack of foreseeing of strategic priorities. But main thing is that all this leads to catastrophic decrease of politics’ public area, because shadow economy and corruption expansion remain the only methods for getting the results from disfunctional system in industry, agriculture, education, medicine, etc.

In this case, media sphere demonstrates the features of extreme simulativeness, where words’ original meanings are totally changed (for example, the meaning of “optimization” concept hides catastrophic decrease of social goods).

Oligarchy survival at this peak demands maximization of socium controllability. This explains the logic of tax reforms, which oriented on increase of repression rights of power structures. At the same time, gradual shutdown of historic memory is taking place: spreading of only such versions, which justify the power concentration.

The point of oversimplification of power hierarchy is acquisition of neofeudalistic features in form of power inheritance and political vassalage, and transformation of independent layers (middle class) and charismatic leaders into main enemies.

In other words, authorities cannot be a uniting factor for society, because they provide only control and permissive functions for survival, frequently by means of deception. Socium is doomed for stepping back from the political sphere and consequently to increase disagreement demonstration.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

Therefore, despite all the assurances of authorities, the sense of nowadays phase of “modernization” is reduced to banal redistribution of remnants of state property and possibility to use state resources for personal advantage.

Condition of Ukrainian society is also dangerous, where the experience of multiple disruptions of connectivity (in order to please the conjuncture interests) is worsened by infinite manipulations with language questions and choice of geopolitical orientation, which cannot but reproduce stereotypes about the impossibility of coexistence of “two Ukraines” – Western and Eastern.

In conditions when authorities grow political strength and lose political grounds, new connectivity is formed on the basis of emotional, immediate ground that assumes sharp forms of disappointment demonstrations and absence of long-term strategy how to overcome reasons of such situation.

Condition of infrastructural connectivity is not optimistic either. Contrary to common opinion about the democratic character of Ukrainian mass media, the period of time when Donetsk clan is in power gives evidence to steady closing up of channels by which socium can influence upon the authorities. “Privatization” of justice brings to naught all the past achievements. At the same time education stops playing a role of social lift, and political elite more and more vivid shows up the marks of alienation from socium (by means of its lifestyle values and ideals).

As was indicated prior, in case of ignoring of crisis demands, political system automatically uses previous experience of system modernization. In modern Ukraine one can observe all the signs of transferring of problems in time (in the form of foreign currency borrows and transfer of state strategic companies to other geopolitical players) and in space (by means of immigration flows stimulation).

In this case demographic disproportions (migrational “washing-out” of young adults and inevitable ageing of population) blur the fact that simplification scenario, started up during perestroika depletes the grounds for existence.

This means that in near future ruling layer again will find itself in a position of urgent necessity of system modernization (but under rather worse conditions). There are very few alternatives: 1) authoritarianism – as a force attempt to remain power; 2) system wreck, loss of sovereignty and transference under control of other geopolitical subjects.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Almond G. A., *Approaches to Developmental Causation in Crisis, Choice, and Change: Historical Studies of Political Development*, Boston 1973..
- [2] Armand D., Liuri D., Zherihin V., *Aanatomya krizisov*, Moskva 1999.
- [3] Bard A., Zoderkvist Y., *Netokratiya. Novaya praviashchaya elita i zhizn posle kapitalizma*, Sankt-Peterburg 2004.

- [4] Binder L., *The Crises of Political Development* in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences in Political Development*, Princeton 1971.
- [5] Coleman J.S., *The Development Syndrome: Differentiation – Equality – Capacity* in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and sequences in political development*, Princeton 1971.
- [6] *Crises and Sequences in Political Development*. Ed. By L. Binder. Princeton 1971.
- [7] Habermas J., *Legitimation Crisis*, London 1973.
- [8] Kennedy P., *Vstupaya v dvadtsat pervyi vek: monografiya*, Moskva 1997.
- [9] Kliayn N., *Doktrina shoka*. Moskva 2009.
- [10] Kulpin-Gubaydullin E., *Aternativy rossiyskoy modernizatsii ili restavratsiya Meidzi porusski*, Polis. 2009. No 5. .
- [11] La Palombara J., *Penetration: A Crisis of Governmental Capacity*, in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences of Political Development*, Princeton 1971.
- [12] Poliakov L., *Metodologiya issledovaniya rossiyskoy modernizatsii*, Polis, 1997, No 3.
- [13] Pye L., *Identity and the Political Culture*, in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences of Political Development*, Princeton 1971, pp. 101-135; L. Pye, *The Legitimacy Crisis*, in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences of Political Development*, Princeton 1971.
- [14] Rozumnyi M., O. Kornievkiy, V. Yablonskiy, *Ukrayina: politychni strategiyi modernizatsiyi*, Kyiv 2011
- [15] Tilly C. , *Western State-Making and Theories of Political Transformation*, in *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*, Princeton 1975.
- [16] Trubitsyn D., *«Modernizatsiya» i «negativnaya mobilizatsiya»: konstrukty i sushchnost*, Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. 2010. No 5.
- [17] Vadzhra A., *Put zla. Zapad: matritsaglobalnoy gegemonii*, Moskva 2007.
- [18] Verba S., *Sequences and Development*, in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences of Political Development*, Princeton 1971.
- [19] Weiner M., *Political Participation: Crisis of the Political Process*, in Leonard Binder et al. (eds) *Crises and Sequences of Political Development*, Princeton 1971.

### KRYZYS SYNDROMU MODERNIZACJI: WARIANT UKRAIŃSKI

W tym artykule obserwuje się ewolucja koncepcji kryzysu syndromu modernizacji. są Analizowane są przyczyny rozbieżnego rozumienia modernizacji i krajowych kryzysów w zachodniej politologii. W artykule została uziemiona konieczność przedłużenia terminu kryzys zespołem modernizacji. Autorka proponuje uwolnienie „kryzysu zespołowego modernizacji”, która pozwala odróżnić kryzysy – powody modernizacji i kryzysy, jaki występują jako wyniki. Zalety proponowanej wersji zespołu kryzysowego mają możliwości co do tego że: 1) ustalenia gradacji szkolenia i rozwoju niespójności systemowych; 2) wziąć pod uwagę fakt, że wielość kryzysów politycznych może być zdeterminowane przez obecnego scenariusza i przez nierozwiązanych problemów z poprzednich projektów modernizacyjnych. W związku z tym, kryteria sukcesu są modernizacja ukraińskiej waluty w świadomości politycznej powodu aktywacji narodu ukraińskiego samoorganizacja, szkolenia narodowej identyfikacji w oparciu o wartości moralnej i konsolidacji społeczeństwa – wszystko co w ogólnym prowadzą do zbiorowego samostanowienia i ustanowienie zbiorowej temat procesu politycznego. W przeciwieństwie do nowoczesnej oficjalnej (państwowej) opinii, wszystko podkreśla, że modernizacja miała miejsce na Ukrainie (w formie „optymalizacji” i „poprawy”), autorka uznaje, że ostatnie dwadzieścia lat określa rozwoju uproszczonego scenariusza modernizacji państwa. To grupowanie oznacza, że po kilku nieudanych próbach modernizacji na Ukrainie ustalili jednoczesności wielokierunkowych zjawisk: degradacji przemysłowych osiągnięć, im stać się archaiczne –

powrót do najbardziej opłacalnych form systemowych na tle przyjęcia niektórych cech nowoczesnego społeczeństwa informacyjnego. Takie współrzędne w zespole kryzysowym modernizacji nie są epizodami w życiu politycznym podanie systemu procesu stopniowej, gdzie jakościowe manifestacje i stopień uszkodzenia zależy od aktywności władz politycznych system są warunki socjalne, zasoby demograficzne systemu politycznego i zachowania środowiska geopolitycznego.

**Słowa kluczowe:** oligarchizacja, modernizacja, modernizacja zespołu kryzysowego, Ukraina.

DOI:10.7862/rz.2013.hss.33

Tekst złożono w redakcji: lipiec 2013

Przyjęto do druku: listopad 2013