

Методологічні основи дослідження внутрішніх та зовнішніх вимірів політичної трансформації країн ЦСЄ

У статті розглянуті методологічні підходи вчених до проблеми демократизації посткомуністичних країн ЦСЄ, які вказують на їх багатоманітність. Вчені обирають у кожному випадку для аналізу конкретної країни адекватний підхід, який дає змогу виявити її специфіку, розкрити суть змін. Демократія – це феномен, що перебуває в постійному розвитку, самооновленні. У ХХІ ст. її особливості вже починають проявлятися. Це впливає і на консолідацію демократії, яка в більшості країн ще в процесі формування, тобто ще не відбулася.

Ключові слова: демократія, методологічні підходи, внутрішні та зовнішні виміри політичної трансформації, Центрально-Східна Європа

Methodological Bases for Research on Internal and External Dimensions of Political Transformation of the CEE Countries

The paper focuses on the scholars' methodological approaches to the problem of democratization of the post-communist CEE countries, which point out their diversity. Every time analyzing any specific country, scholars choose an adequate approach, which helps to display its specificity, reveal the essence of the changes. Democracy is a phenomenon in its constant development, self-renewal. In the 21st century its characteristic features have started the process of their exposing. It also influences consolidation of democracy, which in most countries is still in the process of formation, i.e. has not occurred yet.

Keywords: democracy, methodological approaches, internal and external dimension of political transformation, Central and Eastern Europe.

Being global as to their scope political transformations, which have expanded in the CEE region, vividly prove that political systems and regimes of the states have been undergoing

considerable reforming for two decades already. In every society their essence is rather specific and has internal and external dimensions: institutional boundaries of political processes formed by the current legal system of a state and a political regime that functions at the level of public authority, which besides formal legal institutions, has other constituents, and the influence of the external environment where the state acts with a diversified system of interconnections, different in their content and forms. The analysis of the methodological bases for research on political transformations in the CEE has attested scholars' considerable interest in the problem of transition to democracy, revealed a great number of methodological approaches used in the course of research, and this is naturally, as a methodological approach emphasizes the most significant things in the phenomenon and in the notion, which is designated by this phenomenon respectively.

To our point of view the leading tendency of the world's political development of the last decades is the transition from totalitarianism and authoritarianism to democracy, for this purpose we take into account the facts of current regimes' collapse in Spain and Portugal, collapse of military dictatorship in Argentina, Brazil, Greece, South Korea, transformational processes in the CEE countries, the attempts of the most independent countries established on the territory of the former USSR to develop democratic political systems. Profound political changes, which occurred in the CEE region, have led to the vital weakening of authoritarian positions and expansion of democratic boundaries, which require thorough research on experience, scrupulous investigation of western and other models of social and political transformations, positive and negative lessons of democratization.

"Fall of communism between 1989 and 1991 across the whole region", states M. A. Vachudova "which was accompanied by the fall of the USSR, appeared to be the key point for political development of Eastern European countries. For many of them it was also a period that led to the mass movement which fought for national independence: the number of states in the "communist" region grew from 9 in 1989 to 27 in 1995"¹. During the period of socialism the CEE countries had a number of significant distinctive features, but the most appreciable difference between them revealed during the post-revolution period. The differences became noticeable from the first years of democratization due to the specific features of historical development, different approaches and different understanding of the CEE countries of the following steps in building democracy, market economy and joining Europe². Such political process was rather peculiar in the Czech Republic³.

¹ Vachudova M. A. *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage and Integration after Communism* / [Transl. from English by Taras Tsymbal]. – K.: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, 2009. – P. 18.

² Dahrendorf R. *After 1989: Morals, Revolution and Civil Society* / [Transl. from English]. – M.: Ad Marginem, 1998. – Pp. 22-23.

³ Žatkuliak J. a kol. *November '89 Medzník vo vývoji slovenskej spoločnosti a jeho medzinárodný context*. – Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV vo vyd. Prodam, 2009. – S. 17.

The experience of the transitional societies proves that movement towards democratic changes is not possible without proper scientific research. The most detailed description of the methodological bases for democratization is given in foreign researchers' papers, as principal political schools, which study stable democratic institutions and traditions, using the experience of democratic countries, have been formed in America and Europe long time ago. In Ukraine democratization has started since the country gained its independence, and at that time first research devoted to this problem appeared. However, there are many "blank pages" of methodological character both in foreign and national studies of political processes in transitional societies.

H. Schultze believes that in spite of the fact that much time has passed since the fall of socialistic political system, the researchers of the processes of political transformations that take place in the CEE countries are rather limited in their capabilities. Some scholars, defining the necessity of studying political processes in these countries as one of the constituents of the worlds' phenomenon of post- authoritarian changes, underline the existence of serious analytical difficulties, while comparing them with the democratic development in other regions of the world⁴. Some of them object the embodiment of the CEE countries into the sphere of general "post-authoritarian comparative studies". Ph. C. Schmitter⁵, T. L. Karl⁶ and V. Bunce⁷ express radical arguments in support of this thesis.

The scholars have not worked out a unified approach to the essential correlation of the notions "transit" and "transformation". V. Helman considers them to be synonymic⁸. But in transitology two dimensions can be singled out: the first studies "transitional period", the second investigates the essential model of political changes, which take place at this stage, i.e. transformation. Transit is defined as the transition of a political regime from one qualitative stage to another, i.e this is an interval between two regimes, with an undetermined final result – development of democracy or return to authoritarianism (A. Kolodii⁹, V. Kobylnyk¹⁰, V.

⁴ Terry S.M. Thinking about Post-Communist Transitions: How Different Are They? // *Slavic Review*. – 1993. – Vol. 52. – № 2. – P. 335.

⁵ Schmitter Ph.C., Karl T.L. The Conceptual Travels of Transitologists and Consolidologists: How Far East Should They Attempt to Go? // *Slavic Review*. – 1994. – Vol. 53. – № 1. – P. 176.

⁶ Karl T.L., Schmitter Ph.C. From an Iron Curtain to a Paper Curtain: Grounding Transitologists or Students of Postcommunism? // *Slavic Review*. – 1995. – Vol. 54. – № 1. – P. 965-966.

⁷ Bunce V. Regional Differences in Democratization: The East Versus the South // *Post-Soviet Affairs*. – 1998. – Vol.14. – № 3. – P. 187-211; Bunce V. Should Transitologists Be Grounded? // *Slavic Review*. – 1995. – Vol. 54. – № 1. – P. 111-127.

⁸ Helman V.Ya. Post-Soviet Political Transformations // *Polis*. – 2001. – № 1. – P. 15. (In Ukrainian)

⁹ Kolodii A. Ukrainian "Orange Revolution": Essence and Lessons for Transitology // *Development of Democracy and Democratic Education in Ukraine: Collected Scientific Papers Following the International Scientific Conference in Lviv, May 20-23, 2005* [Electronic Resource]. – Access Mode: <http://www.lvivacademy.com/visnik/cv/kolodiy.html>. (In Ukrainian)

¹⁰ Kobylnyk V. Peculiarities of Democratization in Post-Communist Societies / Vasyl Kobylnyk // *Political Science in Ukraine: Current State and Prospects: Proceedings of the All-Ukrainian Scientific Conference (Lviv, May 10-11, 2007)* [Ed. M. Polishchuk, L. Skochylas, L. Uhryn]. – Lviv: TsPD, 2008. – P. 119. (In Ukrainian)

Leshchenko¹¹, O. Marchak¹², O. Nikonorov¹³, O. Romaniuk¹⁴, H. Shypunov¹⁵). The scholars underline that in case of transition to democracy the phases of liberalization, democratization and socialization can be singled out.

D. Rustow conventionally distinguishes 5 main components in transit: preconditions; initial point of political transit; aim of transit (state of society, political system and regime which are strived for by reformers); the process of transit itself with specific content; transit outcome (depends on the circumstances of democratic process development)¹⁶. He points out that transition to democracy is a complex social and political aspect which includes 3 successive stages – preparatory, decision making and adaptation of the society to new political and economic mechanisms; the crucial role for political consensus is played by the previous conditions, viz. national unity, minimal level of economic development, existence of social differentiation in society. These problems are emphasized by Hungarian political scientist R. Tökes¹⁷.

In 1990s A. Przeworski wrote that democracy is just one of the possible results of authoritarian regimes collapse and distinguished the processes of a state democratization (in the meaning of institutions) and democratization of a political regime, i.e. changes in relations between the state and civil society¹⁸. Such approach as a recognition of transition variety in the CEE countries: imitation of the western patterns, formation of hybrid regimes, return to authoritarianism, critical attitude to the application of classical theoretical transitology for generalizing processes that take place in the CEE, has become a commonly accepted in

¹¹ Leshchenko V.M. Triad Methodological Interpretation of Transitional Path of a Political Party // Modern Ukrainian Politics. Politicians and Political Analysts about It. – K.: UTsPM, 2010. – Issue. 19. – Pp. 48-49. (In Ukrainian)

¹² Marchak O.M. Democratic Transit in Post-Communist Countries: Theoretical and Methodological and Application Aspects: Author's Abstract of Dissertation for the Degree of Candidate of Political Sciences: speciality. 23.00.02 «Political Institutions and Processes». – Odesa, 2007. – Pp. 5-6. (In Ukrainian)

¹³ Nikonorov O.V. Problems of Transformation of Political Regime in Ukraine // Modern Ukrainian Politics. Politicians and Political Analysts about It. – K.: UTsPM, 2010. – Issue. 19. – Pp. 18-19. (In Ukrainian)

¹⁴ Romaniuk O.I. Models of Post-Communist Transformations // Political Management. – 2006. – № 3. – Pp. 36-38. (In Ukrainian)

¹⁵ Shypunov H. Methodology of Analysis of the Transforming Societies: Transitological Approach // Political Science in Ukraine: Current State and Prospects: Proceedings of the All-Ukrainian Scientific Conference (Lviv, May 10-11, 2007) [Ed. M. Polishchuk, L. Skochylas, L. Uhryn]. – Lviv: TsPD, 2008. – Pp. 43-45. (In Ukrainian)

¹⁶ Rustow D. Transitions to Democracy: Toward to Dynamics Model / Dankwart Rustow // Polis. – 1995. – № 5. – Pp. 9-10.

¹⁷ Tökes R.L. Transitology: Global Dreams and Post-Communist Realities / R.L.Tökes // Central Europe Review. – 2000. – Vol. 2. – № 10. – Pp. 180-181.

¹⁸ Przeworski A. Democracy and the Market; Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America / A. Przeworski; [Transl. from English by Yu. H. Alekseeva and others]; Ed. V. A. Bazhanova. – M.: ROSSPEN, 1999. – P. 65.

national, Russian and Western science (V. Burdiak¹⁹, H. Weinstein²⁰, T. Carothers²¹, A. Pakharev²², F. Rudych²³).

Every time new democratic political reality has increased its hold in peculiar, individual, but inevitable connection with the previous non-democratic traditions. V. Bunce assumes that “the processes of social formation take place in an imitated cultural society, in a single social fund of finished patterns of symbols, interpretation, perception, explication of social action, which occurs in a modern world”²⁴. The process is characterized by cultural traumas, among which one can single out: firstly, non-confidence syndrome; secondly, anxious expectation of future; thirdly, nostalgia for the past; fourthly, political apathy; fifthly, post-communist traumas of collective memory²⁵. M. A. Vachudova adhering the theory of “path-dependency”, which she calls the problem of “inheritance”, points out that “post-communist states, evidently, have not descended from the one place and undoubtedly they do not walk in the same direction. The spectrum of the results of political evolution among²⁷ post-communist countries impressed in 1995: they varied from consolidated democracies to consolidated authoritarian regimes, and between these poles there were different intermediate variants”²⁶.

Next methodological approach, which is worth describing while studying democratization of the CEE countries and which gives an opportunity to analyze the most important processes is an evolutionary one. Thus, in the Czech Republic he search for the social mechanism of fair distribution of social goods among people has started since the Middle Ages, during the Hussite Revolution²⁷, and carried on during the next centuries, and the idea itself was identified with democracy. Russian scholar A. Kovler in his research “Crisis of Democracy? Democracy on the Edge of the 21st century”²⁸, says, that modern democracy which was

¹⁹ Burdiak V. Transformation of Post-Socialist Countries: Unification or Expansion of Variations of Democratic Tread // Uzhhorod University Academic Newsletter. Series: Political Science, Sociological Science Philosophy. – Issue 12. – Uzhhorod: Hoverla, 2009. – Pp. 201-206. (In Ukrainian); Burdiak V. I. Globalization and Political Transformations in European Post-Socialist Countries // Innovational Development of Society under the Conditions of Cross-Cultural Interactions. Proceedings of the 2nd All-Ukrainian Scientific Conference. April 27-30, 2009, Sumy. – Sumy: SOIPPO, 2009. – Pp. 82-84. (In Ukrainian)

²⁰ Weinstein H. Russia: Politics, Economy, Russian Transit in the Context of Global Democratization // World's Economy and International Relations. – 2000. – № 10. – Pp. 78-80. (In Russian)

²¹ Carothers T. The End of Transition Paradigm // Journal of Democracy. – 2002. – Vol. 13. – № 1. – P. 8.

²² Pakharev A. Post-Soviet Political Regimes: between Authoritarianism and Democracy / A. Pakharev // Political Management. – 2010. – Special Issue. – Pp. 13-14. (In Ukrainian)

²³ Political Regime and the Rule of People in Ukraine: Politological Analysis: Monograph / Ed. prof. F. M. Rudych. – K., 2011. – 498 p. (In Ukrainian)

²⁴ Bunce V. Regional Differences in Democratization: The East versus the South / V. Bunce // Post-Soviet Affairs. – 1998. – Vol.14. – № 3. – P. 189.

²⁵ Sztompka P. Cultural Trauma in Post-Communist Society / P. Sztompka // Sotsis. – 2001. – № 2. – Pp. 3-12; Sztompka P. Social Change as a Trauma / P. Sztompka // Sotsis. – 2001. – № 1. – Pp. 6-16.

²⁶ Vachudova M. A. Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage and Integration after Communism / [Transl. from English by Taras Tsymbal]. – K.: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, 2009. – P. 18.

²⁷ Kubai I. M. Influence of the Hussite Revolution on Institutional and Ethnic and National Processes in the Czech Lands at the End of the 14th – the Beginning of the 16th Centuries: Author's Abstract of Dissertation for the Degree of Candidate of Political Sciences. – Chernivtsi, 2009. – Pp. 5-6. (In Ukrainian)

²⁸ Kovler A. I. Crisis of Democracy? Democracy on the Edge of the 21st century / Ed. B. N. Topomin. – M.: RAN, IGIP, 1997. – P. 31. (In Russian)

commenced in the 18th century and the beginnings of which can be traced back to antiquity, in the 20th century underwent such crisis, which can cast doubt on its existence, that modern crisis of democracy has several symptoms, namely national identity crisis, crisis of forms of political activity, civic consciousness crisis. These words can be referred to the Czech Republic, where democracy was originated in 1918, together with the First Czech Socialist Republic and evolved up to 1968 in Czechoslovakia, revived in 1989-1992 in Czecho-Slovakia and finally reached the level of consolidation, developing since 1993 in the Czech Republic.

Considering whether should democracy exist or not in the 21st century, A. Kovler studies democracy in various dimensions of theory and practice and observes, that it is time to reinterpret traditional principles of democracy; analyses problems of democratic centre and periphery, peculiarities of western and eastern democracy development. He highlights various paths of democratization: redemocratization after foreign occupation (Denmark, countries of Benelux Union, Austria); reformation of political institutions after liberation (France, Italy); implementation of democracy by foreign occupants (Germany, Japan); change of authoritarian regimes (CEE countries); democratization by agreement with opposition (Spain)²⁹.

Modern interpretations of democracy differ in approaches to studying its characteristic features, procedures, implementation sphere, produced values. A. Madatov denotes following approaches to democracy investigation: political and institutional (for political regime analysis); processual and procedural (for characterizing vital activity of any society at the state and local levels, including political parties); culturological, which combines democracy with certain social culture, based on the principles of individual's autonomy, toleration and civil responsibility; axiological, which indicates specific political and social values, is inseparably connected with the liberation principle, human rights and creation of maximal conditions for personal development³⁰.

However B. Guggenberger singles out only 2 types of conceptual approaches in the theory of democracy: normative and empirical-descriptive (descriptive)³¹. Within the frames of the normative approach the scholar analyses and proves the issue of democracy in an ideal state and how it surpasses other forms of public management. Empirical and descriptive approach accentuates attention on real democracy and its practical actions. We believe, that such differentiation allows providing approximate orientation, as normative principles appeal to experience, political practice, and empirical principles and theoretical structures are never limited by realias, which are interpreted and classified according to certain aspects. Within the

²⁹ Kovler A. I. Crisis of Democracy? Democracy on the Edge of the 21st century / Ed. B. N. Topornin. – M.: RAN, IGIP, 1997. – P. 15. (In Russian)

³⁰ Grachev M. N., Madatov A. S. Democracy: Methodology of Study, Analysis of Vistas. – M.: Publishing House «ALKIGAMMA», 2004. – Pp. 3-4. (In Russian)

³¹ Guggenberger B. The Theory of Democracy // Polis. – 1991. – № 4. – P. 141.

models there are various tendencies to research, aimed at determined tasks, with emphasis on some elements of the problem.

Most Czech academicians interpret democracy as a rational form of the state system, using rational and utilitarian approach, which determines democracy as an effective form of governance, which harmoniously combines people's and social groups' interests. Democracy is a dynamic form of reaction to the social processes which gives a chance to solve many problems; a society with an effective mechanism of search, selection and choice of political decisions in case of people's and society's initiatives realization; fundamentally connected with market economy and let one judge about the openness of the society to any ideas and solutions of social development tasks, chosen by people.

Rational and utilitarian grounds for democracy one can find in N Luhmann's³² system theories and K. Deutsch's work "The Nerves of Government: Models of Political Communication and Control"³³. The scientists consider democracy to be a rational form of state governing, not from the point of view of humanist values, but as the most suitable way of adaptation to external conditions, a possibility for preservation and development of best social conditions for people. N. Luhmann, due to the evolutionary approach to analysis of societies, describes the dynamics of evolution of all important spheres of sociality: law, politics, science, education, religion, art, economy and love. The main principle of the evolution theory, he defines as "evolution transforms any little chance of appearance of any phenomenon into a large possibility of its preservation"³⁴. Modern interpretation of evolution is the idea of changes in nature and society, their direction, order and regularities; and in narrower sense it is defined as a slow, gradual change, as opposed to revolution³⁵.

N. Luhmann states that system theory differentiates between the system and the external world, which influences it. Differentiation between the system and the external world makes evolution possible, as any system cannot evolve from itself. Systemic and theoretical basis of evolution is understood as the circumstance, according to which structural changes can occur in the system, but they must succeed in the external world. Evolutional diversification and multiplied systems are diversification and multiplication of the external worlds. The minimal precondition of evolution is suitability of the system to the external world³⁶. This approach helps while analyzing democracy as a form of political system of a society, which is defined as a system. The external spheres for a political system can become economic, social, spiritual

³² Luhmann N. *The World Society as a Social System* / [Transl. from German by A. Antonovskiy]. – M.: Publishing House „Logos”, 2004. – P. 93.

³³ Deutsch K.W. *The Nerves of Government: Models of Political Communication and Control* / Karl W. Deutsch. – N. Y.: Free Press, 1963. – P. 25.

³⁴ Luhmann N. *Evolution* / [Transl. from German by A. Antonovskiy]. – M.: „Logos”, 2005. – P. 8.

³⁵ *The Great Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. 2nd edition, revised and enlarged. – M.: „The Great Russian Encyclopedia”; StP: „Nornint”, 1998. – P. 1388. (In Russian)

³⁶ Luhmann N. *Evolution* / [Transl. from German by A. Antonovskiy]. – M.: „Logos”, 2005. – P. 29.

spheres of any society, political systems of other countries. Political system of a society is external for a political institution.

A huge role in the theory of evolution is played by a happenchance. He writes that “the system substitutes its need for the full knowledge of the external world for something that is a chance for it. Only due to this evolution is possible”³⁷. The happenchance is interpreted as “the connection of the system with the external world, which slips out of synchronization with the help of the means of the system”, “the ability of the system to make use of the events, which cannot be carried out and coordinated by the system itself. From this point of view a happenchance is understood as danger, chance, favourable conditions”³⁸. N. Luhmann’s approach is backed up by R. Dahl who points out that “the triumph of democracy is usually determined by a number of lucky chances. But these chances fully depend on what we do”³⁹.

R. Dahl states that “impulse to democratic governance descended from “logic of equality”⁴⁰, when all members of the union strived for taking mutual decisions. Such conditions appeared 500 B.C. in ancient Greece and Rome and existed for several centuries. The decline of ancient democracies was caused by the internal system problems, which could not have been solved by own efforts. Communicative processes between various structures were inefficient and did not help in eliminating controversy. Societies were segmented, and the system way of conflicts solution was not institutionalized.

Modern democracies, based on traditions, acquire new essential and procedural characteristics. The precondition for democratization is the process of political systems’ sovereignty formation and constitutional validity of their regimes. Sovereign states stipulate relatively homogeneous regime of power relations on their territories, and this settles monopoly on violence. In contradiction to the state, appears civil society with its non-violent, contracting self-organization according to the norms of the natural law and human rights.

Democracy in the 20th century has proved its vitality and demonstrated positive methods in solving various political, social and economic tasks, but realias of the 21st century put in doubt its further efficient functioning. It is connected with a new phase of democracy evolution, with challenges of the time. Difficulties related to the democratic governance exist in non-consolidated and classical democracies, and this indicates their inner problems. V. I. Kovalenko states that “serious questions arise as for the correlation between representative action democracy and direct democracy, political democracy and its other types, democracy and economic growth, human rights in the global world and so on”⁴¹.

³⁷ Ibid. – P. 41.

³⁸ Ibid. – P. 42.

³⁹ Dahl R. On Democracy. – M.: Aspect Press, 2000. – P. 30.

⁴⁰ Ibid. – P. 16.

⁴¹ Kovalenko V. I. Problems of Transforming Democracy in the Context of New Challenges / V. I. Kovalenko // Newsletter of Moscow University. Series. 12. // Political Sciences. – 2007. – №2. – P. 4. (In Russian)

Former president of Poland W. Jaruzelski does not deny the acknowledgement of the deep character of radical system changes, but at the same time he underlines their qualitatively new, peaceful, gradual, prolonged character and offers the notion of “evolutional revolution”⁴². This definition is rather close to the process of “reflution” – a combination of a number of vigorous measures of revolutionary nature with essential, but rather prolonged, peaceful reforms. This term belongs to the British journalist and political analyst T. G. Ash⁴³. Historian from Russia V. V. Mariina believes that events since 1989 are “rather” a revolution, and not a single time, but of “an evolutional character, prolonged in time”⁴⁴.

Backing up the ideas of the prominent academicians, let us remind that “the Velvet Revolutions” took place in the regions of Central and South-East Europe simultaneously, but now this region, which once was seen as a homogeneous one, and nearly all was a part of a socialist camp and Soviet military block, is not associated any more with Eastern Europe, but again has been divided into two traditional historical parts. “The Velvet Revolutions” had various forms: from “round tables” between authority and opposition, first, after the long break, multiparty elections and mass people movements. The discussions over the nature of those events in various countries have been still held. And the revolutions themselves do not have strict definitions, though are usually described with the help of such adjectives as “democratic” and “anti-communist”. To our point of view, it should be mentioned that to some extent they were counter-revolutionary, as they not only eliminated current system, but restored the former one, though at another stage of its development.

Revolutions and post-revolutionary development of the post-communist countries clearly showed the imaginable homogeneity of this European region. The very notion “the Velvet Revolutions” is more suitable for the CEE countries, but is absolutely inadmissible if one describes the events in Romania or countries from the post-Yugoslavian region. On the basis of this, we assume that the revolution of 1989 in Czechoslovakia must be analyzed with the help of the evolutionary approach, which has been mentioned above, and that in this country as opposed to other central European countries, one revolutionary shock was not enough, and through the number of subjective reasons there were two such shocks in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in 1989 and in 1992.

R. Dahrendorf stated “to become better, at first must become worse. Even if successive policy leads to the fact that the stores will be full of goods, and money will acquire real value, not substituted by the black market rate, many people will still earn very little salary to allow buying these goods, and many will lose their jobs. It is difficult to say how much time it will

⁴² Jaruzelski W. *Lessons of History Are Not Salt on the Wounds* / W. Jaruzelski; Interviewed by V. Oskotsky. – Ryazan: Uzoroche, 2000. – P. 32. (In Russian)

⁴³ Ash T.G. *We the People: the Revolution of '89 Witnessed in Warsaw, Budapest, Berlin and Prague* / T.G. Ash. – Cambridge: Granta Books, 1990. – P. 67.

⁴⁴ *Public Transformations in the Countries of Central and South-East Europe (90s of the 20th – Beginning of the 21st century)* / Ed. Yu.S. Novopashyn. – M.: Slavonic Studies Institute RAN, 2008. – P. 307. (In Russian)

take to pass it, but undoubtedly more than the term of the first parliament. It is quite possible that all this will cause disappointment among many people, so acute, that it will put at threat new constitutional structure and economic reforms, which have been promised so many times and brought so little good for people⁴⁵.

Subjective reasons are much related to “new democracies”. O. Encarnacion states, that they demonstrate main formal attributes of political democracy, namely free and competitive elections, but deprived of any essential inclination to values, associated with liberal democracy, tolerance, government responsibility and respect to human rights in particular⁴⁶. Finally, neglection of stable values leads to erosion of democracy.

Most political analysts refer objective reasons for problems of modern democracies with globalization processes. H. Weinstein supposes that “there is blurring of national state sovereignty, an increase in transparence of its boundaries and detection of higher dependence of its inner life upon the external factors which have global character”. This limits authoritative powers of the state internal institutions, lowers quality of their functioning, on the basis of democratic government⁴⁷. Global interdependence violates habitual democratic order of managing political and social and economic processes.

Among major methodological approaches to the study of the indicated problem it is necessary to mention neo-institutionalism. Ukrainian scholars A. Kolodii⁴⁸, M. Lendel⁴⁹, A. Romaniuk⁵⁰ believe that neo-institutionalism, as opposed to the classical institutionalism, confers equal importance on formal institutions – a state, self-government, parties; and non-formal ones, which are fixed in the society at the level of practice and influence people’s behavior and value formation. This approach helps to analyze the influence on the flow of political process not only within formalized structures, but also unwritten rules of political interrelation, study cause-and-effect relationship between different levels of politics. It should be mentioned that in 80s of the 20th century the founders of the normative school of neo-institutionalism J. March and J. Olsen came to the conclusion that the crucial point for interpretation of the essence of political development of society was a composition of institutions⁵¹.

⁴⁵ Dahrendorf R. After 1989: Morals, Revolution and Civil Society / [Transl. from English]. – M.: Ad Marginem, 1998. – P. 94.

⁴⁶ Encarnación O.G. Tocqueville’s Missionaries. Civil Society Advocacy and the Promotion of Democracy. URL // [Electronic Resource]. – Access Mode: <http://old.russ.ru/politics/meta/20010222-tok.html>

⁴⁷ Weinstein H.I. Variable World and Problems of Democracy Functioning // World Economy and International Relations. – 2007. – № 9. – P. 11. (In Russian)

⁴⁸ Kolodii A. Neo-institutionalism and Its Cognitive Means in Political Research / Antonina Kolodii // Lviv University Newsletter: Philosophical Sciences. – Issue 9. – Lviv: Ivan Franko LNU, 2006. – P. 60. (In Ukrainian)

⁴⁹ Lendel M. Modern Methodological Approaches to Study of Local Political Processes (in the Context of the CEE Countries) // Lviv University Newsletter: Philosophical and Politological Studies. – 2010. – Issue 1. – Pp. 97-105. (In Ukrainian)

⁵⁰ Romaniuk A. New Institutionalism and the Notion of Institution in Political Science / Anatolii Romaniuk // Lviv University Newsletter: Philosophical Sciences. – Issue 9. – Lviv: Ivan Franko LNU, 2006. – Pp. 190-199; (In Ukrainian)
Romaniuk A. Main Stages of Development of the Political Thought in the 20th century / Anatolii Romaniuk // Lviv University Newsletter: Philosophical and Politological Studies. – 2010. – Issue 1. – Pp. 19-28. (In Ukrainian)

⁵¹ March J.G. Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics / J.G. March, J.P. Olsen. – New York: Free Press / Macmillan, 1989. – P. 134.

D. North emphasizes that “institutions” are the rules of the game within the society or restrictions made by people: formal (organizations) and non-formal. First determine structures of any political system and forms of its legitimate power. Other are defined as traditions, customs, moral values or mutual agreements. Formal rules can be quickly changed by taking legal or political decisions, while customs and traditions etc. evolve in the process of institutionalization, as they are stipulated by the previous development⁵². Having used this concept for analysis of political post-communist development of the CEE region, one can discover institutionalization of norms, roles, values and standards of political conduct, which is vital for democratization. There are three scholar schools, which study the reasons of institutional choice of post-communist societies: school of social and economic modernization, which emphasizes the role of economic development, urbanization and spread of communication; school of political culture, according to which people’s orientations determine stability of democratic institutions; school of dependence theory, where current development depends on the historical development path (*path-dependency*) or in other words, historical institutionalism, which recognizes the role of the former institutional and cultural inheritance in the process of the new rules creation. We suppose the combination of the 2nd and the 3rd approaches to be rather efficient for analyzing politics in the CEE, and interrelation between these approaches fully harmonizes with the methodological tools aimed at investigation of the transformational process in the post-communist CEE countries and it is reasonable to use them during the research.

Therefore, the abovementioned scholars’ methodological approaches to the problem of democratization of the post-communist CEE countries point out their diversity. Scholars, choosing certain approaches, complete them with their own views and in every case, they choose an adequate approach, which helps to display its specificity, reveal the essence of the changes. However, the research still continues, as in modern democracy people choose what they think is useful for self-development, due to the possibilities it grants. That is why, democracy is a phenomenon in its constant development, self-renewal. Democracies of various social eras are rather different. In the 21st century democracy will also acquire its characteristic features, which have just started the process of their exposing. Processes of new democracies formation and consolidation in the CEE countries are complex and contradicting. The post-communist period showed their differences in economic, social and political structures, notwithstanding the similar influence of socialism. Progressive governmental economic reforms caused the decay of living conditions. All this influenced consolidation of democracy which in most countries is still on the stage of formation, i.e. has not been realized yet.

⁵² North D. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. – K.: Osnovy, 2000. – P. 198.