

The “dilemma of simultaneity” as a conceptual predictor of post-communist countries of Europe modernization’s logistics: theoretical and methodological cut

The article is devoted to theoretical and methodological analysis of the “dilemma of simultaneity” as the conceptual predictor of post-communist Europe modernization’s logistics. It was determined that the initial premise to overcome the “dilemma of simultaneity” was political modernization or democratization of post-communist countries of Europe and that in some countries modernization was realized in three areas, and in some other countries in four areas (i.e. in the form of a “triple” or “quadruple” transition). The author argued that the “dilemma of simultaneity” as a proper and on time logistics model of post-communist transformation and modernization in various European countries is not fully methodologically unified. It was also revealed that initially the “dilemma of simultaneity” was a dichotomy (in political and economic areas), but later became a trichotomy (including issues of territorial and national restructuring). In addition, initially the “dilemma of simultaneity” had negative direction, but nowadays is a positivist value. At the same time, it was argued that overcoming the “dilemma of simultaneity” is an overcome and turning such results of institutional development of post-communist European countries as modernity, statehood and prospects of the EU membership.

Keywords: transit, transformation, modernization, the “dilemma of simultaneity”, post-communist countries of Europe.

«ДИЛЕМА ОДНОЧАСНОСТІ» ЯК КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНИЙ ПРЕДИКТОР ЛОГІСТИКИ МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЇ ПОСТКОМУНІСТИЧНИХ КРАЇН ЄВРОПИ: ТЕОРЕТИКО-МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНИЙ ЗРІЗ

Стаття присвячена теоретико-методологічному аналізу «дилеми одночасності» як концептуального предиктора логістики модернізації посткомуністичних країн Європи. Визначено, що ініціальною передумовою подолання «дилеми одночасності» була політична модернізація або демократизація посткомуністичних країн Європи, а також, що в деяких країнах модернізація реалізовувалась в трьох аспектах чи сферах, а в деяких – в чотирьох (тобто у формі «потрійного» чи «чотирного» транзиту). Аргументовано, що «дилема одночасності», будучи належною та своєчасною логістичною моделлю посткомуністичної трансформації і модернізації різних країн Європи, не повною мірою є уніфікованою

методологічно. Виявлено, що ініціально «дилема одночасності» була дихотомічною (політичною та економічною), але вже згодом стала трихотомічною (включаючи проблематику територіальної і національної реструктуризації). Крім того, ініціально «дилема одночасності» мала негативістське спрямування, а сьогодні має позитивістське значення. Одночасно, аргументовано, що подолання «дилеми одночасності» здебільшого виявилось подоланням і досягненням таких результатів процесів інституційного розвитку посткомуністичних країн Європи, як модерність, державність і перспективи вступу й сам вступ до ЄС.

Ключові слова: *транзит, трансформація, модернізація, «дилема одночасності», посткомуністичні країни Європи.*

In the course and as a result of the collapse of the USSR and the system of political, social-economic relations limited by the "Warsaw Pact" post-communist European countries within the frames of logistics and plans for their modernization had not only to expand democracy and market economy, but sometimes create new state institutions and modern nations. The result is that nowadays it is a generally accepted fact that transformation processes in post-communist European countries had their peculiarities, which in no way resembled analogous processes in non-post-communist countries. Taking into account a large scale of tasks, which were to be solved within the course of modernization, political elites of post-communist countries of Europe faced a question: which sphere or spheres require top-priority modernization/reformation. Concerning this in the then and modern science have been elaborated two approaches as to solution of a problem: the first appealed to the consistent stages of social-economic and political modernization (on the pattern of the most Western European countries), while the second focuses on the simultaneity of stages of diversified modernization (what had not been peculiar of state reforms' logistics before). However, the most interesting appeared to be conclusions and outcomes of the processes of modernization in different post-communist European countries, as on the average the most successful were the countries which modernized all spheres of national life not gradually, but simultaneously. It became the reason for theoretical-methodological focusing on the essence of simultaneous political, social-economic, system and sometimes national reformation and modernization, what in political science is usually described as a "dilemma of simultaneity" concept.

The proposed range of problems has been directly or indirectly studied in works by such scholars as: L. Balcerowicz¹, J. Beyer², J. Brada³, V. Bunce⁴, M. Dobry⁵, J. Elster⁶, S. Fischer and A. Gelb⁷, O. Havrylyshyn, I. Izvorski and R. Van Rooden⁸, R. Kollmorgen⁹, T. Kuzio¹⁰, W. Merkel¹¹, C. Offe¹², J. Sachs¹³, D. Travin i V. Gelman¹⁴, H. Wiesenthal¹⁵, C. Wyplosz¹⁶, W. Zapf¹⁷, G. Zelenko¹⁸ and others. Crucial and significant markers/categories became modernization, reform, transit and logistics, which allow (in particular owing to the empirical experience of multidirectional processes in various post-communist European countries) theoretical-methodological redefinition and verification of the essence of the “dilemma of simultaneity” concept. However, complex theoretical-methodological analysis of the “dilemma of simultaneity”, in particular the issue of

- ¹ L. Balcerowicz, *Understanding Postcommunist Transitions*, [w:] L. Diamond, M. Plattner (eds.), *Democracy after Communism*, Wyd. Johns Hopkins University Press 1996, s. 63-77.
- ² J. Beyer, *Beyond the Gradualism-Big Bang Dichotomy: The Sequencing of Reforms and Its Impact on GDP*, [w:] J. Beyer, J. Wielgoths, H. Wiesenthal (eds.), *Successful Transitions. Political Factors of Socio-Economic Progress in Post-socialist Countries*, Wyd. Nomos 2001, s. 23-39.; J. Beyer, *Transformationssteuerung als Governance-Problem*, [w:] F. Bönker, J. Wielgoths (eds.), *Postsozialistische Transformation und europäische*, Wyd. Metropolis 2008, s. 79-94.; J. Beyer, J. Wielgoths, H. Wiesenthal, *Successful Transitions. Political Factors of Socio-Economic Progress in Post-socialist Countries*, Wyd. Nomos 2001.
- ³ J. Brada, *The Transformation from Communism to Capitalism: How far? How Fast?*, „Post-Soviet Affairs“ 1993, vol 9, nr. 1, s. 87-110.
- ⁴ V. Bunce, *The Political Economy of Post-Socialism*, „Slavic Review“ 1999, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 754-793.
- ⁵ M. Dobry, *Introduction: When Transitory Meets Simultaneous Transitions*, [w:] M. Dobry (ed.), *Democratic and Capitalist Transitions in Eastern Europe: Lessons for the Social Sciences*, Wyd. Kluwer Academic Publishers 2000, s. 1-14.
- ⁶ J. Elster, *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Economic and Political Reform*, [w:] P. Polzajski (ed.), *Philosophy of social choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1990, s. 309-316.; J. Elster, *The Possibility of Rational Politics*, „Archives Européennes de Sociologie“ 1987, vol 28, nr. 1, s. 67-103.
- ⁷ S. Fischer, A. Gelb, *The Process of Socialist Economic Transformation*, „Journal of Economic Perspectives“ 1991, vol 5, nr. 4, s. 91-105.
- ⁸ O. Havrylyshyn, I. Izvorski, R. Van Rooden, *Recovery and Growth in Transition Economies 1990-97: A Stylized Regression Analysis*, „IMF Working Paper“ 1998, vol 98/141.
- ⁹ R. Kollmorgen, *Theories of Postcommunist Transformation. Approaches, Debates, and Problems of Theory Building in the Second Decade of Research*, „Studies of Transition States and Societies 2013, vol 5, nr. 2, s. 88-105.
- ¹⁰ T. Kuzio, *The National Factor in Ukraine's Quadruple Transition*, „Contemporary Politics“ 2000, vol 6, nr. 2, s. 143-164.
- ¹¹ W. Merkel, *Die Konsolidierung postautoritärer und posttotalitärer Demokratien: Ein Beitrag zur theorieorientierten Transformationsforschung*, [w:] H. Süßmuth (ed.), *Transformationsprozesse in den Staaten Ostmitteleuropas*, Wyd. Nomos 1998, s. 39-61.; W. Merkel, *Plausible Theory, Unexpected Result: The Rapid Democratic Consolidation in Central and Eastern Europe*, „Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft“ 2011, vol 2, s. 11-29.; W. Merkel, *Restriktionen und Chancen demokratischer Konsolidierung in postkommunistischen Gesellschaften: Ostmitteleuropa im Vergleich*, „Berliner Journal für Soziologie“ 1994, vol 4, s. 463-484.; W. Merkel, *Systemtransformation*, Wyd. VS-Verlag 2010.; W. Merkel, *Theorien der Transformation post-autoritärer Gesellschaften*, [w:] K. von Beyme, C. Offe (eds.), *Politische Theorien in der Ära der Transformation*, Wyd. Politische Vierteljahresschrift 1996, s. 30-58.
- ¹² C. Offe, *Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory Facing the Triple Transition in East Central Europe*, „Social Research“ 1991, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 865-881.; C. Offe, *Das Dilemma der Gleichzeitigkeit. Demokratisierung und Marktwirtschaft in Osteuropa*, „Mercur“ 1991, vol 4, s. 279-292.; C. Offe, *Dilemma odnoveremnosti: demokratizatsiya i rinochnaya ekonomika v Vostochnoy Evrope*, [w:] P. Shtyikov, S. Shvanits, V. Gelman (eds.), *Povoroty istorii: Postsotsialisticheskie transformatsii glazami nemeckikh issledovateley*, Wyd. Letniy sad 2003, vol 2, s. 6-22.; C. Offe, *Varieties of Transition. The East European and East German Experience*, Wyd. Polity Press 1996.
- ¹³ J. Sachs, *Crossing the Valley of Tears in East European Reform*, „Challenge“ 1991, vol 34, nr. 5, s. 26-34.
- ¹⁴ D. Travin, V. Gelman, „Zagugulinyi“ rossiyskoy modernizatsii: smena pokoleniy i traektorii reform, „Neprikosovennyiy zapas“ 2013, vol 4, nr 90, źródło: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2013/4/2g.html> [odczyt: 1 listopada 2016].
- ¹⁵ H. Wiesenthal, *Contingencies of Institutional Reform: Reflections on Rule Change, Collective Actors, and Political Governance in Post-socialist Democracies*, Wyd. MPG Arbeitsgruppe Transformationsprozesse 1996.; H. Wiesenthal, *Politics Against Theory: On the Theoretical Consequences of Successful Large-Scale Reforms in Postcommunist Europe*, „Perspectives on European Politics and Society“ 2002, vol 3, nr. 1, s. 1-22.; H. Wiesenthal, *The Dilemma of Simultaneity Revisited – Or Why General Skepticism about Large-Scale Reform Did Not Apply to the Postcommunist Transformations*, Prepared for the International Conference „Thirty Years of the Third Wave of Democratization: Paradigms, Lessons, and Perspectives“, Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB), December 10-11, 2004.
- ¹⁶ C. Wyplosz, *Ten Years of Transformation: Macroeconomic Lessons*, Paper prepared for the Annual World Bank ABCDE Conference, Washington, April 28-30, 1999.
- ¹⁷ W. Zapf, *Modernisierung und Modernisierungstheorien*, [w:] W. Zapf (ed.), *Die Modernisierung moderner Gesellschaften*, Wyd. Campus 1991, s. 23-39.
- ¹⁸ H. Zelenko, *Navzdohimna Modernizatsiia: Dosvid Polshchi ta Ukrainy*, Wyd. Krytyka 2003.

its conceptual expediency, has not been elaborated or has been conducted peripherally in the political science. Therefore, the aim of the research is a theoretical-methodological systematization and verification of the "dilemma of simultaneity" concept as a predictor of modernization logistics in post-communist European countries.

Before we directly appeal to the concept under study, let us focus on the theoretical-methodological remark provided by H. Zelenko¹⁹ that the crucial factors for modernization in post-communist European countries were social-cultural/social, economic and political level of development of society in this or that country, as well as the fact that in post-communist countries of Europe (at least in those which managed to modernize themselves fully or nominally) did not exist arguments as to necessity or irrelevance of reformation. However, in post-communist countries of Europe namely political modernization was of the highest priority, as in countries with a nonorganic type of modernization political sphere is traditionally a synthetic one towards the others. It influenced the ways of modernization in post-communist European countries which started and occurred just in the sphere of politics, i.e. when there was political will for changes. And thus consistent political modernization was a factor and a guarantor for improvements in all other spheres of social life. Importance of political modernization revealed in the fact, that it secured institutional provision of democracy functioning and included: differentiation of political structure, when there was formed a branching network of social-economic, political and other institutions of the society, which were immediately aimed at providing stability and order; structural and essential transformation of a political system, which was aimed at disclosing all of its potentialities, formation of a political structure of social action, elaboration of political strategies and political tactics as the instruments for transformation. Besides, initial political modernization was rather significant as it promoted implementation of democratic procedures in all spheres of social process what means: rationalization and assurance of power efficiency as crucial factors of governments' credibility and its support by people; provision of wide participation of citizens in political life; creation of integral and mutually agreed at different levels system of political socialization; commitment to ensure a feedback between a political system and a person²⁰. As a result, namely political modernization or democratization determined scenarios of further modernization/reformation process in post-communist countries of Europe.

Another theoretical-methodological remark is a position according to which inequality of development of various spheres of social life in post-communist European countries led to the fact that these countries in their political and social spheres were to carry out tasks, concerning their modernization, whereas in the economic field these task were connected with post-modernization. It was presupposed by several factors of early transit of post-communist European countries, in particular by the facts that: a) over a certain period of time democratization

¹⁹ H. Zelenko, *Navzdohimna Modernizatsiia: Dosvid Polshchi ta Ukrainy*, Wyd. Krytyka 2003, s. 18-20.

²⁰ O. Babkina, V. Horbatenko, *Politologia: Posibnyk dlia studentiv vysshchych navch. zakladiv*, Kiev 2001, s. 280-282.

processes in post-communist countries of Europe were being held within a strictly designated space, in isolation from a global process of democratization and on the basis of its own ideology, and thus had different duration and sometimes were characterized by divergences; b) over the years of “real socialism” regime there was formed a special social-economic, political and ideological environment, which had a great impact on the transitional processes in the post-communist period; c) setting up of communistic regimes led to disintegration of civil societies, artificial simplification of social and class structure of societies and demolition of all structures and ties, which formed the grounds for political, economic, cultural and ideological pluralism. Namely this promoted the appearance of such a significant peculiarity of young post-communist democracies in Europe, as a need for simultaneous or maximally synchronized accomplishment of social-economic and political transformations²¹. It explained the fact that transformations in post-communist countries could have and frequently had a synchronized character and quite often simultaneously occurred in political, economic, social-cultural, system and even national spheres. Besides, substantial influence on the course of modernization transformations had the fact that reforms in post-communist countries of Europe often took place in parallel with nationhood maintenance. And this, as T. Kuzio²² states, means that in some post-communist countries modernization was actualized in three aspects or spheres, and in some countries even in four (that is in a form of a “triple” or “quadruple” transit).

At the same time, it is important that in political science there has never been a theoretical-methodological unanimity as to the fact whether multidirectional modernization and reformation had to be consistent or simultaneous in post-communist countries. Thus, some researchers insisted on incompatibility of simultaneous transformations in the economic and political sphere and noted that before starting democratization post-communist governments had to concentrate on implementation of economic reforms or on the contrary to appeal to introduction of democracy previously to commencement of economic reforms²³. A. Aslund insisted on initial character of political reformation and stated that for post-communist countries democratization was an essential precondition for a successful transition to market economy²⁴. The same opinion is shared by Z. Brzezinski who believes that “political reform serves as an initial basis for effective economic reform, and certain democratic political consensus and effective political process are vital conditions for the first critical phase of transformations in post-communist countries”²⁵. A controversial opinion was supported by the adherents of the

²¹ H. Zelenko, *Navzdohinna Modernizatsiia: Dosvid Polshchi ta Ukrainy*, Wyd. Krytyka 2003, s. 18-20.

²² T. Kuzio, *The National Factor in Ukraine's Quadruple Transition*, „Contemporary Politics” 2000, vol 6, nr. 2, s. 143-164.

²³ L. Armijo, T. Bierkster, *The Problems of Simultaneous Transitions*, [w:] L. Diamond, M. Plattner (eds.), *Economic Reform and Democracy*, Baltimore 1995, s. 230.

²⁴ G. Vainshtein, *Postkommunistyckeskie razrytye blazany zapadnoi politytolohyy*, „Myrovaia ekonomyka i mezhdunarodne otmoshenyia” 1997, vol 8, s. 145.

²⁵ Z. Brzezinski, *The Great Transformation*, „The National Interest” 1993, vol 33, s. 6.

"dilemma of simultaneity" concept, in particular C. Offe²⁶, J. Elster²⁷, W. Merkel²⁸, A. Przeworski²⁹, A. Umland³⁰, V. Gelman and D. Travin³¹, H. Wiesenthal³², who clearly remarked that successful reforms in post-communist European countries, especially since 1989, might have been rather multidirectional, though have occurred to the fullest degree simultaneously. Finally, another group of scientists, for example H. Zelenko³³, argued that there could not be a universal recipe concerning the subsequence of post-communist transformations in Europe. At the same time, as more than twenty-year experience of the analyzed countries shows (nowadays they are mostly interpreted as post-communist ones), there is a significant opposition between factual actualization and positive verification of successfulness of simultaneous reforms and modernization. Therefore, systematic and theoretical-methodological understanding of the essence of the "dilemma of simultaneity" concept is extremely important, as can serve as a model of other political regimes' transition in future.

When we deal with theorization of the "dilemma of simultaneity", first of all we proceed from the methodological remark made by C. Offe (perhaps the "founder" of the analyzed concept), according to which the scale of reforms in different post-communist countries of Europe did not have analogues in the world history. The reason could be a need for simultaneous nature of modernization processes. Continuing his logics and reflecting on the prospects of post-communist transformations in the early 90-s of the 20th century the scientist states that transformation and modernization under post-communist circumstances had at least a three-dimensional character. The point is that post-communist European countries faced the necessity to change one-party regimes (or regimes on the basis of party-hegemon) for competitive democracies, planned systems in economy for market mechanisms and empire

²⁶ C. Offe, *Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory Facing the Triple Transition in East Central Europe*, „Social Research” 1991, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 865-881.; C. Offe, *Das Dilemma der Gleichzeitigkeit. Demokratisierung und Marktwirtschaft in Osteuropa*, „Merkur” 1991, vol 4, s. 279-292.; C. Offe, *Dilemma odnoveremnosti: demokratizatsiya i rinochnaya ekonomika v Vostochnoy Evrope*, [w:] P. Shryikov, S. Shvanits, V. Gelman (eds.), *Povoroty istorii. Postsotsialisticheskie transformatsii glazami nemetskih issledovateley*, Wyd. Letniy sad 2003, vol 2, s. 6-22.

²⁷ J. Elster, *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Economic and Political Reform*, [w:] P. Polszajski (ed.), *Philosophy of social choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1990, s. 309-316.

²⁸ W. Merkel, *Die Konsolidierung postautoritärer und posttotalitärer Demokratien: Ein Beitrag zur theorieorientierten Transformationsforschung*, [w:] H. Süßmuth (ed.), *Transformationsprozesse in den Staaten Ostmitteleuropas*, Wyd. Nomos 1998, s. 39-61.; W. Merkel, *Plausible Theory, Unexpected Result: The Rapid Democratic Consolidation in Central and Eastern Europe*, „Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft” 2011, vol 2, s. 11-29.; W. Merkel, *Theorien der Transformation post-autoritärer Gesellschaften*, [w:] K. von Beyme, C. Offe (eds.), *Politische Theorien in der Ära der Transformation*, Wyd. Politische Vierteljahresschrift 1996, s. 30-58.

²⁹ A. Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market. Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1991.

³⁰ A. Umland, *Pochemu Evropeyskomu Soyuzu sleduet predostavit stranam Vostochnogo partnerstva perspektivu chlenstva v ES*, „Geopolitika”, źródło: http://www.geopolitika.lt/index.php/ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/file_download.php?artc=5685 [odczyt: 1 listopada 2016].

³¹ D. Travin, V. Gelman, „Zagolublyeniye” *rossiyskoy modernizatsii: smena pokoleniy i traektorii reform*, „Neprikosnovennyiy zapas” 2013, vol 4, nr. 90, źródło: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2013/4/2g.html> [odczyt: 1 listopada 2016].

³² H. Wiesenthal, *The Dilemma of Simultaneity Revisited – Or Why General Skepticism about Large-Scale Reform Did Not Apply to the Postcommunist Transformations*, Prepared for the International Conference „Thirty Years of the Third Wave of Democratization: Paradigms, Lessons, and Perspectives”, Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB), December 10-11, 2004.

³³ H. Zelenko, *Navzdohimna Modernizatsiia: Dosvid Polshchi ta Ukrainy*, Wyd. Krytyka 2003, s. 18-20.

regimes for national states³⁴. Almost the same views were shared by A. Przeworski³⁵ and J. Elster³⁶, who together with C. Offe argued that the logical model of the “dilemma of simultaneity” constructed in such a way lied in the fact that if the countries of the “old” Europe at first came through a long way of national-state building, later created the basics for capitalism and only then transferred to democracy (besides the process of modernization were not always successful and quite often witnessed “throwbacks” over the centuries and decades), then the countries of the “new” Europe had to solve all the tasks simultaneously, as they faced a “triple” or even a “quadruple” transit, carrying out difficult and painful reforms in all spheres at the same time, “right there and then”. Consequently, the researchers in different ways argued that necessity of simultaneous achieving effective economic and political reforms makes successful “integral reforms” absolutely senseless³⁷.

Moreover, taking into consideration the fact that temptation to extend all changes in time, to build up a succession (at first market, then democracy or vice versa) or completely reject the reforms was too strong. C. Offe supposed that the “dilemma of simultaneity” meant that despite all obvious obstacles and challenges, only simultaneous implementation of democracy and market reforms could bring to the post-communist countries, namely Poland, Slovakia, Hungary and the Czech Republic, quite a rapid success, while the attempts to solve all these tasks “step by step” posed a threat of escalating political, economic and social crises³⁸. J. Elster shared the same position and in late 80-s – early 90-s of the 20th century, when the systems of Central-Eastern European countries just started their formation (renovation) in his work “The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Economic and Political Reforms”³⁹ hypothesized that in Central-Eastern European countries, namely in Poland, Slovakia, Hungary and the Czech Republic it appeared to be possible to combine such transit categories as “necessity”, “impossibility” and “simultaneity”. The point is that transformation of communist regimes in the region over the period of the “third wave” of democratization was considerably different from the “shifts” of political regimes during the “first” and “second” waves of democratization. The main distinction was that two or even three transformational processes took place simultaneously in the region: political transformation (from authoritarianism to democracy), economic transformation (from a planned-controlled economy to the market one) and system

³⁴ C. Offe, *Das Dilemma der Gleichzeitigkeit. Demokratisierung und Marktwirtschaft in Osteuropa*, „Merkur“ 1991, vol 4, s. 279-292.; C. Offe, *Dilemma odnoveremnosti: demokratizatsiya i vnochnaya ekonomika v Vostochnoy Evrope*, [w:] P. Shryikov, S. Shvanits, V. Gelman (eds.), *Povoroty istorii: Postsotsialisticheskie transformatsii glazami nemetskikh issledovateley*, Wyd. Letniy sad 2003, vol 2, s. 6-22.

³⁵ A. Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market. Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1991.

³⁶ J. Elster, *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Economic and Political Reform*, [w:] P. Polzajski (ed.), *Philosophy of social choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1990, s. 309-316.

³⁷ W. Merkel, *Plausible Theory, Unexpected Result: The Rapid Democratic Consolidation in Central and Eastern Europe*, „Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft“ 2011, vol 2, s. 11-29.

³⁸ C. Offe, *Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory Facing the Tripie Transition in East Central Europe*, „Social research“ 2004, vol 71, nr 3, s. 501-528.

³⁹ J. Elster, *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Economic and Political Reform*, [w:] Polzajski P. (ed.), *Philosophy of social choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1990, s. 309-316.

transformation (formation of national states). Besides, in this case transformation was understood as a historical process of changes, which is a unity of several components – transformation of the political system of the society, transformation of a “political person” (human being, elite, collective body and organization), transformation of political culture of the society and a person (ideas, norms, level of political relations). In its turn, political transformation must be interpreted on the basis of sovereignty, political participation, supremacy of law, stability of democratic institutions, political and social integration, while economic transformation was distinguished on the basis of the level of social and economic development, structure of market and competitive processes, currency and price stability, respect to private property, level of a general welfare, stability and effectiveness of the economic system etc. However, the most important is the fact that changes in Central-Eastern Europe by their essence correspond to the changes which earlier had taken place in Western Europe. But in the western world these processes occurred evolutionally and gradually, but not simultaneously and accelerationally.

As a result, it is absolutely clear that the researchers interpreted the “dilemma of simultaneity” as an appropriate and well-timed logistic model of post-communist transformation and modernization of various European countries. Also, the scientists drew attention to theoretical-methodological and prognostic peculiarities and essence of the “dilemma of simultaneity” and argued that its overriding in different post-communist countries of Europe was possible due to consolidation of internal and external factors and stimuli of political, economic, social (system) and perhaps national transformation, as well as democratization, liberalization and modernization in general. On the other hand, they discovered that the assumption concerning the obstacles between the political-driven introduction of capitalism and construction of democratic institutes on the basis of the “dilemma of simultaneity” concept has not got through the final empirical evaluation, as a result of which the concept in the form of hypothesis in the theoretical-methodological perspective is often positioned as an “exhausted” one. In current paper on these grounds we repeatedly justify, that temptation of elites to extend all transformations in time, to build up a succession into a “logical chain” or completely reject the reforms was too strong.

One can place emphasis on the fact that the tasks, which were set before post-communist countries of Europe were in fact deviant in comparison with the problems of other democratic transitions from the past. However, till the middle of the first decade of the 21st century all or almost all countries in the region quite smoothly and successfully transformed into consolidated or semi-consolidated democracies. Besides, these countries in average needed 15 years to create more or less competitive market economies, stable liberal democracies, integrated national communities, substantial civil structures and functional administrative machine. Moreover, development of some post-communist countries of Europe since the fall of “the iron curtain” became a well-deserved example, worthy of admiration for the transformational success. As a result, nowadays former post-communist European countries are a valuable element of the

EU. Even more, as a result of the financial crisis, which commenced in the EU in the late 2008, namely “new” countries of Europe, and not “old” EU members found themselves at advantage. In general, it means that the “dilemma of simultaneity” appeared to be less serious for post-communist countries of Europe, than theoreticians and practitioners of the transit from the regimes of “real socialism” earlier believed. All this makes us argue, that the “dilemma of simultaneity” displays the fact that a simple unification of three or four problems of transit, transformation and modernization is not an explicative factor in post-communist development, but rather plays a role of “logical interrelation” between the patterns of reforms. Such presentation of a problem means that simultaneity, interdependence and internal logics influence the fact how each sphere of transit and transformation may become a reason for further obstacles and even “mutually obstructive effects” in the sphere of “pursuing modernization processes”. Relating to this, it is evident that consolidation of democracy, for instance, must theoretically become more complicated due to the structural complexity of transit of various sectors of national economy. And on the contrary, each component of the “dilemma of simultaneity” overriding process may intensify each other in case of their successfulness.

At the same time, it is necessary to pay attention to the theorization by H. Wiesenthal⁴⁰ concerning the idea that the “dilemma of simultaneity” is not methodologically unified to the fullest extent. The point is, that different post-communist countries, which in due time experienced the “dilemma of simultaneity” diversified on the basis of their starting environment, as well as the choice, made on the eve of triggering reformation-modernization process. Due to this and taking into account variable influence of political elites, different “local” conditions, national and regional peculiarities of development, they finally managed to achieve excellent modernization results at different times. As C. Offe⁴¹ supposed, that the “dilemma of the simultaneity” in average is justified and substantiated by the so-called “possibility of rational policy”, when political actors and ordinary citizens clearly realize accuracy of choice of reformation-modernization movement. And this means that solution to the “dilemma of simultaneity” cannot be absolutely assigned to the gradualism or radical logistics of reformation, transformation and modernization⁴². In other words: desire to implement as much as possible transformations and reforms does not mean or guarantee and sometimes even neutralizes social comprehension and institutional reliability of political elites⁴³. Besides, at first sight it seems that “one-time” effects of multidirectional reforms are not so much synchronized to be interpreted as instantaneous.

⁴⁰ H. Wiesenthal, *The Dilemma of Simultaneity Revisited – Or Why General Skepticism about Large-Scale Reform Did Not Apply to the Postcommunist Transformations*, Prepared for the International Conference „Thirty Years of the Third Wave of Democratization: Paradigms, Lessons, and Perspectives”, Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB), December 10-11, 2004.

⁴¹ J. Elster, *The Possibility of Rational Politics*, „Archives Européennes de Sociologie” 1987, vol 28, nr. 1, s. 67-103.

⁴² J. Elster, *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Economic and Political Reform*, [w:] Polzajski P. (ed.), *Philosophy of social choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1990, s. 309-316; C. Offe, *Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory Facing the Triple Transition in East Central Europe*, „Social Research” 1991, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 865-881.

⁴³ H. Wiesenthal, *The Dilemma of Simultaneity Revisited – Or Why General Skepticism about Large-Scale Reform Did Not Apply to the Postcommunist Transformations*, Prepared for the International Conference „Thirty Years of the Third Wave of Democratization: Paradigms, Lessons, and Perspectives”, Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB), December 10-11, 2004.

For example, this is theorized by the thing that democratization and market reforms cannot be simultaneously correlated with economic growth⁴⁴.

Therefore, it is obvious that the "dilemma of simultaneity" concept is constructed as a result of rationally-oriented denial of the hypothesis of "necessity and impossibility of simultaneous economic and political reforms"⁴⁵. It means, that initially the "dilemma of simultaneity" had dichotomized nature (political and economic), but later it turned into a trichotomized one (including problems of territorial and national restructuring). Moreover, in the beginning the "dilemma of simultaneity" had negative coloring, as C. Offe elaborated it as a predictor of impossibility of reforms and modernization of all spheres of state life⁴⁶. The explanation was hidden in the arguments that "stern" desire for the "shock therapy", which must have become a source for constructing democratic-capitalistic model of development of post-communist Europe, was expected not only as unsustainable, but obviously not very promising from the perspective of logistics. Consequently, a failure of the "shock therapy" must have resulted in non-overriding of the "dilemma of simultaneity" and approaching towards the logic of succession of changes and reforms⁴⁷. Only later, especially in consequence of operationalization and approbation of the concept, the "dilemma of simultaneity" from being impossible acquired positivist assignment, as on the basis of it scientists started to speak of perspectives of synchronous modernization in other regions and countries of the world⁴⁸. For this were made many steps in modernization direction, which revealed that a combination of radical economic reforms in the shape of the "shock therapy" and a strategy of a "big bang" on the one hand and radical democratization, on the other hand, is possible and even effective. The point is that their synthesis has not appeared to be an ephemeral phenomenon, but on the contrary brought profound system-related results.

Though, on the contrary it gave W. Merkel and H. Wiesenthal a chance to argue that overriding of the "dilemma of simultaneity" in fact appeared to be overcoming and comprehending of such results of processes of institutional development in post-communist European countries as modernity, statehood and opportunities of joining the EU and factual accession to

⁴⁴ A. Åslund, *The Advantages of Radical Reform*, 'Journal of Democracy' 2001, vol 12, nr 4, s. 42.; J. Beyer, *Beyond the Gradualism-Big Bang Dichotomy: The Sequencing of Reforms and Its Impact on GDP*, [w:] J. Beyer, J. Wielgoch, H. Wiesenthal (eds.), *Successful Transitions. Political Factors of Socio-Economic Progress in Post-socialist Countries*, Wyd. Nomos 2001, s. 23-39.

⁴⁵ J. Elster, *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Economic and Political Reform*, [w:] P. Polszajski (ed.), *Philosophy of social choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1990, s. 309-316.; A. Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market. Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1991.

⁴⁶ C. Offe, *Varieties of Transition. The East European and East German Experience*, Wyd. Polity Press 1996.

⁴⁷ L. Balcerowicz, *Understanding Postcommunist Transitions*, [w:] L. Diamond, M. Plattner (eds.), *Democracy after Communism*, Wyd. Johns Hopkins University Press 1996, s. 63-77.; W. Zapf, *Modernisierung und Modernisierungstheorien*, [w:] W. Zapf (ed.), *Die Modernisierung moderner Gesellschaften*, Wyd. Campus 1991, s. 23-39.

⁴⁸ R. Kollmorgen, *Theories of Postcommunist Transformation. Approaches, Debates, and Problems of Theory Building in the Second Decade of Research*, 'Studies of Transition States and Societies' 2013, vol 5, nr 2, s. 88-105.; J. Beyer, *Transformationssteuerung als Governance-Problem*, [w:] F. Bönker, J. Wielgoch (eds.), *Postsozialistische Transformation und europäische*, Wyd. Metropolis 2008, s. 92.; M. Dobry, *Introduction: When Transistology Meets Simultaneous Transitions*, [w:] M. Dobry (ed.), *Democratic and Capitalist Transitions in Eastern Europe: Lessons for the Social Sciences*, Wyd. Kluwer Academic Publishers 2000, s. 3-4.

the Union⁴⁹. On the other hand, it substantiates our previous hypothesis, according to which system modernization of post-communist countries of Europe started with political modernization or democratization, as the latter appeared to be a “driver” of economic competitiveness, impressive enhancement of economic efficiency and welfare of population⁵⁰.

References:

1. Armijo L., Bierkster T., *The Problems of Simultaneous Transitions*, [w:] Diamond L., Plattner M. (eds.), *Economic Reform and Democracy*, Baltimore 1995.
2. Åslund A., *The Advantages of Radical Reform*, „Journal of Democracy“ 2001, vol 12, nr. 4, s. 42-48.
3. Babkina O., Horbatenko V., *Politolohiia: Posibnyk dlia studentiv vyshchych navch. zakladiiv*, Kiev 2001.
4. Balcerowicz L., *Understanding Postcommunist Transitions*, [w:] Diamond L., Plattner M. (eds.), *Democracy after Communism*, Wyd. Johns Hopkins University Press 1996, s. 63-77.
5. Beyer J., *Beyond the Gradualism-Big Bang Dichotomy: The Sequencing of Reforms and Its Impact on GDP*, [w:] Beyer J., Wielgoths J., Wiesenthal H. (eds.), *Successful Transitions. Political Factors of Socio-Economic Progress in Post-socialist Countries*, Wyd. Nomos 2001, s. 23-39.
6. Beyer J., *Transformationssteuerung als Governance-Problem*, [w:] Bönker F., Wielgoths J. (eds.), *Postsozialistische Transformation und europäische*, Wyd. Metropolis 2008, s. 79-94.
7. Beyer J., Wielgoths J., Wiesenthal H., *Successful Transitions. Political Factors of Socio-Economic Progress in Post-socialist Countries*, Wyd. Nomos 2001.
8. Brada J., *The Transformation from Communism to Capitalism: How far? How Fast?*, „Post-Soviet Affairs“ 1993, vol 9, nr. 1, s. 87-110.
9. Brzezinski Z., *The Great Transformation*, „The National Interest“ 1993, vol 33, s. 6.
10. Bunce V., *The Political Economy of Post-Socialism*, „Slavic Review“ 1999, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 754-793.
11. Dobry M., *Introduction: When Transition Meets Simultaneous Transitions*, [w:] Dobry M. (ed.), *Democratic and Capitalist Transitions in Eastern Europe: Lessons for the Social Sciences*, Wyd. Kluwer Academic Publishers 2000, s. 1-14.
12. Elster J., *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Economic and Political Reform*, [w:] Polszajski P. (ed.), *Philosophy of social choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1990, s. 309-316.
13. Elster J., *The Possibility of Rational Politics*, „Archives Européennes de Sociologie“ 1987, vol 28, nr. 1, s. 67-103.
14. Fischer S., Gelb A., *The Process of Socialist Economic Transformation*, „Journal of Economic Perspectives“ 1991, vol 5, nr. 4, s. 91-105.
15. Havrylyshyn O., Izvorski I., Van Rooden R., *Recovery and Growth in Transition Economies 1990-97: A Stylized Regression Analysis*, „IMF Working Paper“ 1998, vol 98/141.

⁴⁹ W. Merkel, *Systemtransformation*, Wyd. VS-Verlag 2010, s. 434.; H. Wiesenthal, *Politics Against Theory: On the Theoretical Consequences of Successful Large-Scale Reforms in Postcommunist Europe*, „Perspectives on European Politics and Society“ 2002, vol 3, nr. 1, s. 1-22.; J. Beyer, J. Wielgoths, H. Wiesenthal, *Successful Transitions. Political Factors of Socio-Economic Progress in Post-socialist Countries*, Wyd. Nomos 2001.

⁵⁰ K. Müller, *Europäisierung – Zur kulturellen Codierung der postkommunistischen Transformation*, [w:] F. Bönker, J. Wielgoths (eds.), *Postsozialistische Transformation und europäische*, Wyd. Metropolis 2008, s. 121-142.

16. Kollmorgen R., *Theories of Postcommunist Transformation. Approaches, Debates, and Problems of Theory Building in the Second Decade of Research*, „Studies of Transition States and Societies 2013, vol 5, nr. 2, s. 88-105.
17. Kuzio T., *The National Factor in Ukraine's Quadruple Transition*, „Contemporary Politics“ 2000, vol 6, nr. 2, s. 143-164.
18. Merkel W., *Die Konsolidierung postautoritärer und posttotalitärer Demokratien: Ein Beitrag zur theorieorientierten Transformationsforschung*, [w:] Süßmuth H. (ed.), *Transformationsprozesse in den Staaten Ostmitteleuropas*, Wyd. Nomos 1998, s. 39-61.
19. Merkel W., *Plausible Theory, Unexpected Result: The Rapid Democratic Consolidation in Central and Eastern Europe*, „Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft“ 2011, vol 2, s. 11-29.
20. Merkel W., *Restriktionen und Chancen demokratischer Konsolidierung in postkommunistischen Gesellschaften: Ostmitteleuropa im Vergleich*, „Berliner Journal für Soziologie“ 1994, vol 4, s. 463-484.
21. Merkel W., *Systemtransformation*, Wyd. VS-Verlag 2010.
22. Merkel W., *Theorien der Transformation post-autoritärer Gesellschaften*, [w:] von Beyme K., Offe C. (eds.), *Politische Theorien in der Ära der Transformation*, Wyd. Politische Vierteljahresschrift 1996, s. 30-58.
23. Müller K., *Europäisierung – Zur kulturellen Codierung der postkommunistischen Transformation*, [w:] Bönker F., Wielgohs J. (eds.), *Postsozialistische Transformation und europäische*, Wyd. Metropolis 2008, s. 121-142.
24. Offe C., *Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory Facing the Triple Transition in East Central Europe*, „Social Research“ 1991, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 865-881.
25. Offe C., *Das Dilemma der Gleichzeitigkeit. Demokratisierung und Marktwirtschaft in Osteuropa*, „Merkur“ 1991, vol 4, s. 279-292.
26. Offe C., *Dilemma odnovennosti: demokratizatsiya i rinochnaya ekonomika v Vostochnoy Evrope*, [w:] Shtyikov P., Shvanits S., Gelman V. (eds.), *Povoroty istorii: Postsotsialisticheskie transformatsii glazami nemetskikh issledovateley*, Wyd. Letniy sad 2003, vol 2, s. 6-22.
27. Offe C., *Varieties of Transition. The East European and East German Experience*, Wyd. Polity Press 1996.
28. Przeworski A., *Democracy and the Market. Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1991.
29. Sachs J., *Crossing the Valley of Tears in East European Reform*, „Challenge“ 1991, vol 34, nr. 5, s. 26-34.
30. Travin D., Gelman V., «Zagugulinyi» rossiyskoy modernizatsii: smena pokoleniy i traektorii reform, «Neprikosnovennyiy zapas» 2013, vol 4, nr 90, źródło: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2013/4/2g.html> [odczyt: 1 listopada 2016].
31. Umland A., *Pochemu Evropeyskomu Soyuzu sleduet predostavit stranam Vostochnogo partnerstva perspektivu chlenstva v ES*, „Geopolitika“, źródło: http://www.geopolitika.lt/index.php/ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/file_download.php?artc=5685 [odczyt: 1 listopada 2016].

32. Vainshtein G., *Postkommunistyckoe razvitye blazamy zapadnoi polytolohyy*, „Myrovaia ekonomyka i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya“ 1997, vol 8, s. 144-154.
33. Wiesenthal H., *Contingencies of Institutional Reform: Reflections on Rule Change, Collective Actors, and Political Governance in Post-socialist Democracies*, Wyd. MPG Arbeitsgruppe Transformationsprozesse 1996.
34. Wiesenthal H., *Politics Against Theory: On the Theoretical Consequences of Successful Large-Scale Reforms in Postcommunist Europe*, „Perspectives on European Politics and Society“ 2002, vol 3, nr. 1, s. 1-22.
35. Wiesenthal H., *The Dilemma of Simultaneity Revisited – Or Why General Skepticism about Large-Scale Reform Did Not Apply to the Postcommunist Transformations*, Prepared for the International Conference „Thirty Years of the Third Wave of Democratization: Paradigms, Lessons, and Perspectives“, Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB), December 10-11, 2004.
36. Wyplosz C., *Ten Years of Transformation: Macroeconomic Lessons*, Paper prepared for the Annual World Bank ABCDE Conference, Washington, April 28-30, 1999.
37. Zapf W., *Modernisierung und Modernisierungstheorien*, [w:] Zapf W. (ed.), *Die Modernisierung moderner Gesellschaften*, Wyd. Campus 1991, s. 23-39.
38. Zelenko H., *Navzdohinna Modernizatsiia: Dosvid Polshchi ta Ukrainy*, Wyd. Krytyka 2003.