

POLITICAL, SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND SYSTEM MODERNIZATION AS COMPONENTS OF A LOGISTIC-TRANSFORMATIONAL PLAN AND PROCESS IN THE POST-COMMUNIST COUNTRIES OF CENTRAL-EASTERN EUROPE

The article is devoted to analyzing political, socio-economic and system modernization as components of a logistic-transformational plan and process in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe. The author argued that the modernization processes in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe were not manifested as simple and consistent logistical-transformational and governmental decisions as the theory prove. The fact is that in the analyzed region, the process of reforming and modernizing was planned and implemented as a simultaneous and systematic combination of economic, political, social, cultural and other systemic transformations in various spheres of public life. Consequently, the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe, in contrast to modernization in other parts of the world, were determined not only by carrying out several complex “transitions” and logistical stages of modernization. As a result, contrary to transitological theory, they were able to almost concurrently implement a pluralistic political system, a market economy and a new model of statehood, thus neutralizing the “dilemma of simultaneosity” and refuting the “impossibility theorem” of transformational development.

Keywords: modernization, logistic-transformational plan and process, reforms, Central-Eastern Europe.

ПОЛІТИЧНА, СОЦІАЛЬНО-ЕКОНОМІЧНА І СИСТЕМНА МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЯ ЯК СКЛАДОВІ ЛОГІСТИЧНО-ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЙНОГО ПЛАНУ ТА ПРОЦЕСУ В ПОСТКОМУНІСТИЧНИХ КРАЇНАХ ЦЕНТРАЛЬНО-СХІДНОЇ ЄВРОПИ

У статті проаналізовано політичну, соціально-економічну і системну модернізацію як складові логістично-трансформаційного плану та процесу в посткомуністичних країнах Центрально-Східної Європи. Аргументовано, що модернізаційні процеси у посткомуністичних країнах Центрально-Східної Європи не виявились на стільки простим та послідовним логістично-трансформаційним й управлінським рішенням, як може засвідчувати теорія. Річ у тому, що в аналізованому регіоні процес реформування та модернізації і планувався, і реалізовувався як одночасне та систематичне поєднання економічних, політичних, соціальних, культурних й інших системних трансформацій

у різних сферах суспільного життя. Відтак посткомуністичні країни Центрально-Східної Європи, на відміну від модернізації в інших частинах світу, детермінувались проведенням не одного, а одночасно кількох складних «переходів» і логістичних етапів модернізації. Як наслідок цього вони, всупереч транзитологічній теорії, зуміли майже одночасно запровадити плюралістичну політичну систему, ринкову економіку та нову модель державності, тим самим нейтралізувавши «дилему одночасності» і спростувавши «теорему неможливості» трансформаційного розвитку.

Ключові слова: модернізація, логістично-трансформаційний план і процес, реформи, Центрально-Східна Європа.

Modernization processes in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe started almost simultaneously in the late 80s – early 90s of the 20th century. But they appeared to be not a simple logistic-transformational and managerial decision, as the theory may show, as taking into account geopolitical position of the region between two powerful policy-makers – the European Union and the USSR/Russia, – after the collapse of the socialist system and regimes of the “real socialism” these countries faced a matter of choice and planning a further vector of their development. The options of such choice were: 1) democratic and social-economic transformation as a part of Euro-integration processes; 2) maintaining connections with Russia; 3) permanent uncertainty. It was amplified by the fact that different paces, developmental character and sometimes even opposite direction of movement influenced the peculiarities of political modernization in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe. Thus, it actualizes the question of defining political, social-economic and system modernization in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe as a part of their transformational logistics plan and process.

This problematics has already been referred to in a number of scientific works, in particular by C. Acuna and W. Smith¹, L. Armijo, T. Bierkster and A. Lowenthal², A. Åslund³, V. Bunce⁴, B. Crawford and A. Lijphart⁵, R. Dutch⁶, G. Ekiert and J. Kubik⁷, J. Elster⁸, O. Encarnacion⁹, J. Linz¹⁰,

¹ Acuna C., Smith W., *The Political Economy of Structural Adjustment: The Logic of Support and Opposition to Neoliberal Reform*, [w:] Smith W., Acuña C., Gamarra E. (eds.), *Latin American Political Economy in the Age of Neoliberal Reform*, Wyd. University of Miami 1994.

² Armijo L., Bierkster T., Lowenthal A., *The Problems of Simultaneous Transitions*, [w:] Diamond L., Plattner M. (eds.), *Economic Reform and Democracy*, Wyd. Johns Hopkins University Press 1995.

³ Åslund A., The Case for Radical Reform, *Journal of Democracy* 1994, vol 5, nr. 4, s. 63–74.

⁴ Bunce V., Comparing East and South, *Journal of Democracy* 1995, vol 6, nr. 3, s. 87–100.

⁵ Crawford B., Lijphart A., Explaining Political and Economic Change in Post-Communist Eastern Europe: Old Legacies, New Institutions, Hegemonic Norms and International Pressures, *Comparative Political Studies* 1995, vol 28, nr. 2, s. 171–199.

⁶ Dutch R., Tolerating Economic Reform: Popular Support for Transition to a Free Market in the Former Soviet Union, *American Political Science Review* 1993, vol 87, nr. 3, s. 590–608.

⁷ Ekiert G., Kubik J., *Strategies of Collective Protest in Democratizing Societies: Hungary, Poland and Slovakia since 1989*, 10-th International Conference of Europeanists Buklet, Chicago 1996.

⁸ Elster J., *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Political and Economic Reforms*, [w:] Ploszajski P. (ed.), *Philosophy of Social Choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1991, s. 309–316.

⁹ Encarnacion O., The Politics of Dual Transitions, *Comparative Politics* 1996, vol 28, nr. 4, s. 477–492.

¹⁰ Linz J., Transitions to Democracy, *Washington Quarterly* 1990, vol 13, nr. 3, s. 143–164.

O. Novakova¹¹, C. Offe¹², D. Ost¹³, P. Roeder¹⁴, J. Weintraub¹⁵ and others. However, these researchers independently appeal to different dimensions of modernization – political, social-economic and system. On the contrary, the task of the current scientific paper is an attempt to arrange and synthesize multifarious components of modernization in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe as an element of managerial-logistic plan and transformational process.

The reviews of literature let us justify that modernization is an essential requirement for setting a new world-order. Nevertheless, even today the notion of modernization is ambiguous and undefined and is interpreted differently by many scientists, and this is initially reflected in the theory of modernization, which passing each stage of its development has been changing and acquiring new characteristics and peculiarities. At the present stage of social development the modernization process must be interpreted as a combination of social-economic, political, cultural and other logistic-managerial operations and transformations in various spheres of social life. At the same time, modernization must be determined as a state's guideline (in political and managerial sector) for implementing qualitative transformations in the society not by copying the experience of the leading countries, but by combining the most popular political, social-economic and other structures, institutions and values, which are endowed with universal and general character and traditional specific nature of certain societies¹⁶.

On this subject, R. Inghart states that “modernization, first of all, is a process in the course of which increase economic and political opportunities ... of the society: economic – by means of industrialization, political – due to bureaucratization. Modernization has great attraction as it helps the society to move from the state of poverty to richness. Therefore, the core of the modernization process is industrialization; economic development becomes a dominant social aim, while a predominant goal at the individual level is determined by the already achieved motivation. Transition from the pre-industrial society to the industrial one is characterized by “an overall rationalization of all spheres of the society”, leads to the shift from traditional, usually religious values, to rationally legal values in the economic, political and social life”¹⁷. Taking into account such formulation and definition we consider political, social-economic and system/cultural/motivational modernization as components of a complex logistic plan and process of modernization. Whereas social-economic modernization is interpreted as a solution of three interrelated problems, namely: modernization of the state economic policy, industrial and technological base and the system of the social protection of population. To its instruments

¹¹ Novakova O., *Politychna modernizatsiia ta rozvytok demokratychnykh protsesiv v suchasni Ukraini*: avtoref. dys... dokt. polit. nauk: spets. 23.00.02 – politychni instytuty ta protsesy, Kyiv 2007.; Novakova O., *Politychnyi protses: sutnist, zmist ta suchasni tendentsii rozvytku*, Wyd. Elton-2 2010.

¹² Offe C., Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory Facing the Triple Transition in East Central Europe, “*Social Research*” 1991, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 865–892.; Offe C., Das Dilemma der Gleichzeitigkeit. Demokratisierung und Marktwirtschaft in Osteuropa, „*Merkur*” 1991, vol 4, s. 279–292.

¹³ Ost D., *Labor, Class and Democracy: Shaping Political Antagonisms in Post-Communist Society*, [w:] Crawford B. (ed.), *Markets, States and Democracy: The Political Economy of Post-Communist Transformation*, Wyd. Westview Press 1995.

¹⁴ Roeder P., The Revolution of 1989: Postcommunism and the Social Science, “*Slavic Review*” 1999, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 743–755.

¹⁵ Weintraub J., *Democracy and the Market. A Marriage of Inconvenience*, [w:] Nugent M. (ed.), *From Leninism to Freedom. The Challenges of Democratization*, Wyd. Boulder 1992.

¹⁶ Dziurczuk V., Kotukov O., Radchenko O., *Politychna modernizatsiia: teoriia ta istoriia: metod. rek. dlia slukhachiv usikh form navch.*, Wyd. NADU 2011, s. 5.

¹⁷ Inghart R., Postmodern: menyayushchiesya tsennosti i izmenyayushchiesya obshchestva, „*Polis*” 1997, vol 4, s. 20.

belong implementation of reforms, aimed at introducing the most effective principles, mechanisms and formats of social-economic process management¹⁸. “Political modernization is a process of formation, development and spread of political institutions and practices, capable of executing the main function of the political system – integration, setting and achieving the aim, reconstructing own cultural pattern and adaptedness to the major modern challenges”¹⁹. Finally, system/cultural/motivational modernization – is a process of reforming system and social consciousness of people in various countries, which, on the one hand, includes their consent to social-economic and political changes, but, on the other hand, is determined by their readiness to the multiple (not always simple and linear) transformations.

In this context it should be mentioned that some scientists equate the process of modernization with democratization of political system, but to our mind it is necessary to take into account the experience of the political development since the mid of the 20th century and up till now and consider the fact that different countries have been moving towards the modern stage of the society under different political and sociocultural circumstances. Thus, studying political and state, logistic-transformational evolution of countries in transition it is obligatory to single out two main models not of simple modernization, but political modernization – authoritarian and democratic, and in no case bring down to a common denominator of any single “logistic chain”. The main difference between them is that: 1. authoritarian political modernization is characterized by: seeking support of a ruling class, effectiveness of employing bureaucratic compulsion and control over instruction execution; strong role of the national sovereign state and compulsion while carrying out modernization projects; presence of the ground-breaking parties, which possess monopoly on power and whose legitimacy is based on the ideological canonization of top officials; obligatory consolidation of the society around the modernization ideology and elimination of alternative positions and ideas; presence of the party-hegemon and several parties (usually not self-maintained, “puppet” parties), which support the leading ideological line; extremely high level of centralization of management and enhancement of bureaucratization of society; development of civil society exclusively under the authority of state government leaders and in the sphere of leading ideological direction; inequality of different social-political spheres, when central executive bodies are developing in an exaggerating manner, while a legislative branch, local administrations and all variants of civil activity are under full control of the executive branch and bear just a formal character²⁰. 2. Democratic political modernization is characterized by: relying on self-organization mechanisms of the society, when the state and political elite must provide favorable conditions for further modernization transformations²¹; acknowledgement of the necessity to create a sover-

¹⁸ Tomanevych L., Sotsioekonomichna modernizatsiia yak chynnyk staloho rozvytku ekonomiky Ukrainy, „*Naukovyi visnyk Lvivskoho natsionalnogo universytetu veterynarnoi medytsyny ta biotekhnologii im. Gzhytskoho*“ 2013, vol 15, nr. 2, s. 361–367.

¹⁹ Novakova O., *Politychna modernizatsiia ta rozvytok demokratychnykh protsesiv v suchasni Ukraini*: avtoref. dys... dokt. polit. nauk: spets. 23.00.02 – politychni instytuty ta protsesy, Kyiv 2007, s. 5.

²⁰ Novakova O., *Politychnyi protses: sutnist, zmist ta suchasni tendentsii rozvytku*, Wyd. Elton-2 2010, s. 128–129.

²¹ Myronenko P., *Forma pravlinnia: politychni transformatsii na zlomi stolit: monobrafia*, Wyd. Akademiia 2014, s. 120.

eign state, functioning not as an instrument of violence, but as an effective mechanism of the society self-organization; weakening positions and legitimacy of traditional elites, appearance and enhancement of modernization elite, and thus, openness and competitiveness of ways of elite formation²²; open character of activity among political elites and bodies of the state power, transparency of the state politics, accountability of political actors before the society; interpretation of the presidential post as the highest level representative of the nation and the determinant of the national interest, and, as a result, rational and pragmatic attitude towards all central institutions and establishments of the state power; provision of political pluralism in the process of system transformations implementation due to which it is possible to achieve consolidation, cooperation and competitiveness of all political actors as leading subjects of modernization, establishment and development of foundations for further functioning of the state apparatus of an open type, which ensures its adaptive potential and ability to withstand the challenges of the time²³.

Therefore, namely the democratic model of political modernization is more effective and promising; though in practice the majority of countries in transition prefer the authoritarian model of political modernization. But any changes that take place in economic, social, cultural or political spheres of the society are closely interrelated and depend on the political and authoritative-managerial process, and thus undergo mutual influence and correlation. Herewith, modernization transformations in the post-communist countries of Europe even theoretically, not saying in practice, differ by their logistic peculiarities and distinctions as to the similar processes in other countries of the world and in comparison with each other. However, the combining factor for the European post-communist countries in the late 80s – early 90s of the 20th century was not only geographical position, but a set of common peculiarities, presupposed by their affiliation with a “socialist camp” at the beginning of the logistic-transformation process. Among them the most significant were: common pre-dominant ideology (years of the communist ideology and authoritarian/totalitarian regime supremacy regularized the tendency towards prevalence of the state values over the social intentions and the principle of “excessive hierarchy” with party elite’s domination in the frames of social-political relations of the society²⁴); full or partial absence of private property and market relations; similar institutional models of the political systems and managerial forms (formally they resemble parliamentary republics, but in fact are different versions of the “party-state”); similarity if not of a political culture, then at least in a number of its components. And in particular this includes specific nature of influence on modernization processes in the countries of post-communist Central-Eastern Europe, which is, first of all, exerted by political-managerial factors, as they managed to mark logistically all planned and implemented vectors of transformations in the analyzed countries.

²² Novakova O., *Politychnyi protses: sutnist, zmist ta suchasni tendentsii rozvytku*, Wyd. Elton-2 2010, s. 128.

²³ Myronenko P., *Forma pravlinnia: politychni transformatsii na zlomi stolit: monobrafia*, Wyd. Akademiia 2014, s. 121–122.

²⁴ Myronenko P., *Forma pravlinnia: politychni transformatsii na zlomi stolit: monobrafia*, Wyd. Akademiia 2014, s. 129.

In this regard, V. Bunce states that logistically-transformational and modernization processes, which were planned at first and have been implemented later on in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe since 1989, were not just a political transition/shift within the frames of exclusively political modernization. It was rather a revolution, which covered transformation of economy, identity, culture, social structure and state²⁵. Many scientists suppose that a proposal to join the European Union, made to the countries of the region, was rather presupposed by political factors, but not economic. As either macroeconomic and social key figures, or the level of development, which at that time did not reach an average rate across the European Union, as well as pace and results of the reforms did not testify the ability of the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe to integrate the “united Europe” quickly and easily. Therefore, I. Seleni, stating the future place of the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe in the EU, says that there existed a high possibility that those countries would become a periphery of the European Union, and thus it is possible to suppose that it will be the so-called “neo-colonialism in the long-term outlook”²⁶.

Another peculiarity of logistically-transformation planning and movement within the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe was the fact that their transits and modernizations were connected with conducting not one, but several complicated “transitions” simultaneously. In this regard in the early 90s of the 20th century K. Offe noted that the countries of the region experienced a “threefold” or even “fourfold” transformations (political, economic, territorial and/or system)²⁷. Such point of view was supported by other researchers, who underlined a multifold character of reformation in Central-Eastern European countries: introduction of pluralistic political system (political modernization), market economy and social system (social-economic modernization) and new sovereignty (system modernization)²⁸. P. Roeder holds the same position noticing the flow of “three revolutions” in the post-communist countries in Central-Eastern Europe, in particular: national (emergence of new national states), political (demolishing powerful authoritarian political regimes of the 20th century), and economic (transition to the market economy)²⁹.

Another complicated moment while conducting modernization-transformational changes in Central-Eastern European countries was not only the necessity to conduct a number of logistic tasks simultaneously, but also the fact that future of such reformation greatly depends on plausibility and real chances to combine the goals which are different in their nature. That is why this issue raised a great deal of discussion among scholars who study post-communist

²⁵ Bunce V., Comparing East and South, *Journal of Democracy* 1995, vol 6, nr. 3, s. 87–100.

²⁶ Seleni I., Stroitelstvo kapitalizma bez kapitalistov – tri puti perehoda ot sotsializma k kapitalizmu, „*Russkie chtenija*” 2006, vol 3 (yanvar-iyun 2006 g.).

²⁷ 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.

²⁸ Laryhina N., Demokratyzatsiia v krainakh Tsentralnoi ta Skhidnoi Yevropy: riznomanitni pidkhody y universalni oznaky, „*Naukovi zapysky IPIEND im. I.F.Kamasa NAN Ukrainy*” 2008, vol 37, s. 234.

²⁹ Roeder P., The Revolution of 1989: Postcommunism and the Social Science, *Slavic Review* 1999, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 743.

transformations. Taking this into consideration, the phenomenon of conducting simultaneous reformation and modernization of political and economic spheres was called a “double transition”. In 1990 J. Linz remarked that “all transitions in the countries with communistic past significantly differ from the transitions which took place in western-European countries not characterized by it, due to ineffective and centralized socialistic economies”³⁰. He believed that the countries of the region had to conduct reforms in social-economic and political spheres simultaneously. However, the implementation of changes in economy and social spheres was more complicated than in politics, because “there was no transitional model from command economic to the market one”. We may trace it taking into account historical regularities of the social-political development, on the basis of which it is possible to deduce that the precondition and impulse for establishing democratic political regime in the countries of Central-Eastern Europe was gradual “ripening of capitalism”. On this subject R. Dutch says that in the past days, in particular before the emergence of new post-communist countries, market economy appeared earlier than democratic institutions did³¹. However, the wish of Central-Eastern European countries to make a synchronized transition towards both democratic regime and market economy became an attempt to create a model of connection between social-economic and political transformations and modernizations as opposed to the old model, which appeared in the course of many years in the late 20th century.

Having evaluated the prospects of success of this “new” model, some scientists denied a possibility of simultaneous radical transformations in the social-economic and political spheres. Moreover, arguments as to the thesis of “impossibility of a double transition” and its logistic planning were initiated from both sides³². On the one hand, argumentation for this thesis was concentrated on a procedural aspect of introducing changes in the social sector and economy, also under the conditions of the fact that system velocity and determination of actions towards democratization are impossible, though necessary for radical transformations in the social-economic sphere. It meant that if under democratic regime there is no chance to achieve consensus on certain issues, then the solution will require actualization of difficult and prolonged political bargaining and search of a compromise. G. Nelson supposes that in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe, where “new democracies” appeared, the process of decision making was even more complicated. The legislative process was largely “bound” by a great number of new parties and interests, which competed against each other. They were striving for “paralyzing some aspects of the economic reform” to derive maximum benefit for themselves³³. Under existence of a “new democracy” a procedural complexity of decision-making

³⁰ Linz J., Transitions to Democracy, *Washington Quarterly* 1990, vol 13, nr. 3, s. 156.

³¹ Dutch R., Tolerating Economic Reform: Popular Support for Transition to a Free Market in the Former Soviet Union, *American Political Science Review* 1993, vol 87, nr. 3, s. 594.

³² Weintroub J., *Democracy and the Market. A Marriage of Inconvenience*, [w:] Nugent M. (ed.), *From Leninism to Freedom. The Challenges of Democratization*, Wyd. Boulder 1992, s. 47.

³³ *Politieskie instituty na rubezhe tysyacheletij*, Wyd. OOO “Feniks” 2001, s. 148.

processes was also enhanced by undetermined relations within the newly created authoritative structures. Therefore, it all had negative effect on reforms in the social-economic sphere and sharply slowed down paces of social-economic modernization and transformation. On the other hand, various arguments adduced by scientists were focused on a negative character of social-psychological and political consequences of radical social-economic changes and transformations under the condition of democratic transition. Some scholars stated that the process of democratization could largely harmed social-economic reforms and vice versa³⁴. The point is that deterioration of living conditions of people, which was caused by reformation of the economic system, declining of living standards and growth in social and material instability could lead to bitter disappointment among various social layers. Therefore, negative effects of reforms in the economic sphere largely influenced the possibility to conduct successful process of democratization.

That is why a great number of scientists, who spoke about impossibility to combine social-economic and political variants of modernization with democratic political regime, are equally of the opinion that not to “come to the deadlock of incompatibility” it is necessary to avoid simultaneous reformation in the social-economic and political spheres. However, they proposed different variants how to prevent this. Thus, some researchers noted that reformation in economy required succession, determination and unpopular decisions, what is inherent to strong authoritarian regimes, and that is why the process of carrying out economic reforms must go before democratization of the political system. Other scientists believe such strategy to be very risky as usually authoritarian regimes fail under liberalization of the economic system, while regimes which actualize successful economic reforms lose (in short-term prospects) impulses towards democratization and take advantage of successes in economic transformations for the sake of stabilizing authoritarianism³⁵. Therefore, such scientists insist that before introducing market reforms it is necessary to strengthen democracy. Thus, democratic transition must be an initial step towards political and economic reformation and modernization of society, as it creates preconditions for further transition to market relations³⁶.

In general, in the late 80s – early 90s of the 20th century the scientists were extremely pessimistic as to the development of the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe after the end of the “cold war” and the collapse of the “real socialism” regimes. They consider that the outcomes of democracy development and establishing of market relations in the countries of the region were rather vague. Among the main reasons of such pessimistic attitude they named implicit or very weak preconditions for democracy, for instance: insufficient level of multi-party system development, lack of professional politicians, low level of civil society development,

³⁴ Armijo L., Bierkster T., Lowenthal A., *The Problems of Simultaneous Transitions*, [w:] Diamond L., Plattner M. (eds.), *Economic Reform and Democracy*, Wyd. Johns Hopkins University Press 1995, s. 229.

³⁵ Encarnacion O., The Politics of Dual Transitions, *Comparative Politics* 1996, vol 28, nr. 4, s. 478.

³⁶ Åslund A., The Case for Radical Reform, *Journal of Democracy* 1994, vol 5, nr. 4, s. 63–74.

non-understanding of supremacy of law³⁷. Quite interesting was the view, proposed by some scientists, that social-economic heritage of the communist regimes was incompatible with establishment of democracy due to a very strong “herd instinct”, social indifference, egalitarian-pater- nalist model of behavior³⁸. They were convinced that successful democratic transformation and political modernization in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe depend on how quickly they would overcome the economic crisis, which was prolonged due to the social-political chaos and which weakened social and institutional foundations of democracy in the region. Therefore, such pessimistic scientific (theoretical-methodological and logistical) predictions disclose a chance of coming into power various authoritarian-populist political regimes at the stage of radical nationalism, or at the best case “dictatorship of intellectuals”, who would rely on “military support”³⁹, as well as spread of “mass disturbances”, which could affect modernization of the society.

However, only a small part of researchers anticipated a possibility of stable social-economic and political development of the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe⁴⁰. However, despite the fact that a large number of analysts after the fall of the “Iron curtain” were skeptical of the prospects for successful process of social-economic and political modernization and democratization of the society, the post-communist countries, which chose the pro-European vector of development, defined their main goal (joining the EU) and focused on quick and qualitative passing the stages of liberalization of the planned economy, restoring civil society, building an independent national state and introducing the process of political system reformation. As all these logistic plans and transformations were to be implemented in all spheres of society simultaneously, it means that reforms in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe since 1989 have been accompanied by the “dilemma of simultaneity” (K. Offe and J. Elster), what implied fast and synchronized transformation of political, social and economic systems⁴¹. Transition in each country was to be successful in order to guarantee successfulness of all other reforms. Even despite the fact that in multiple cases the result of reformation of one sphere was blocked by reforms in other spheres. For instance, a great number of those who suffered losses due to the economic reforms could (and did) take advantage of political power and pressure on voters during the elections in order to eliminate from the political arena those who introduced those social-economic reforms. In other words, the theoreticians

³⁷ Crawford B., Lijphart A., Explaining Political and Economic Change in Post-Communist Eastern Europe: Old Legacies, New Institutions, Hegemonic Norms and International Pressures, *Comparative Political Studies* 1995, vol 28, nr 2, s. 189.

³⁸ Elster J., *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Political and Economic Reforms*, [w:] Płoszajski P. (ed.), *Philosophy of Social Choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1991, s. 309–316.

³⁹ Ost D., *Labor, Class and Democracy: Shaping Political Antagonisms in Post-Communist Society*, [w:] Crawford B. (ed.), *Markets, States and Democracy: The Political Economy of Post-Communist Transformation*, Wyd. Westview Press 1995, s. 342.

⁴⁰ Ekiert G., Kubik J., *Strategies of Collective Protest in Democratizing Societies: Hungary, Poland and Slovakia since 1989*, 10-th International Conference of Europeanists Buklet, Chicago 1996, s. 181.

⁴¹ Elster J., *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Political and Economic Reforms*, [w:] Płoszajski P. (ed.), *Philosophy of Social Choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1991, s. 309–316.

of the “dilemma of simultaneity” anticipated confrontation between the winners and losers as a result of reforming political, social and economic systems⁴².

Despite the fact that in the early 90s of the 20th century the implementation of so many reforms simultaneously, at the first sight, appeared to be an extremely difficult and almost impossible task, at the beginning of the 21st century the majority of the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe succeeded in achieving their aim, joining the EU and being transformed into consolidated democracies (though in some of them the situation has not remained identical after 10 years, but they at least did not “roll back” sharply). After approximately 15 years these countries managed to create competitive economies, stable liberal democracy, integrated national society, fundamental administrative structure. In spite of all underestimated previous predictions of skeptical analysts in the early 90th of the 20th century, the prospects of entering the EU became a counter-force, which managed to neutralize the “dilemma of simultaneity” and refute the “theorem of impossibility” of a modernization process. The point is that logistically defined modernization processes in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe, which declared themselves in the simultaneous transformations of social, economic and political spheres and systems, in the late 90s of the 20th led to formation of a new social, economic and political reality. It found itself in democratic transformation of the political system, construction of the civil society, transition to the market economy and development of the national state. That is why B. Greshkovych, who focuses on the structural and functional essence, assumes that taking this in consideration it is possible to call these systems “dual democracies”⁴³. The essence of dualism is in basis of the mechanism of decision-making on the union of the ruling elite and “strategic opposition” with the aim to neutralize the majority in opposition. Concluding and evaluating the situation in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe in the late 90s of the 20th century we argue that predictions of the majority of analysts and scientists were pessimistic and unconvincing. Notwithstanding a profound economic crisis and simultaneous implementation of social-economic and political transformations none of the democratic systems in the region failed. Therefore, protests in the society characterized by a local and non-violent character and authoritarian-populist and nationalistic appeals on the behalf of the ruling elites may have different variations but in no way influence political pluralism⁴⁴. At the same time, it is important that political process in the 90s of the 20th century determined popularization of democratic tendencies while creating the political system and establishing mechanisms of functioning social-political dialogue between the governmental institutions and civil society. Therefore namely this vector of social-political development

⁴² Offé C., Das Dilemma der Gleichzeitigkeit. Demokratisierung und Marktwirtschaft in Osteuropa, „*Merkur*” 1991, vol 4, s. 279–292.

⁴³ Acuna C., Smith W., *The Political Economy of Structural Adjustment: The Logic of Support and Opposition to Neoliberal Reform*, [w:] Smith W., Acuña C., Gamarra E. (eds.), *Latin American Political Economy in the Age of Neoliberal Reform*, Wyd. University of Miami 1994, s. 17.

⁴⁴ Latyhina N., Demokratyzatsiia v krainakh Tsentralnoi ta Skhidnoi Yevropy: riznomanitni pidkhody y universalni oznaky, „*Naukovi zapysky IPiEND im. I.F.Kurasa NAN Ukrainy*” 2008, vol 37, s. 240.

assigned democracy as a fundamental phenomenon in the permanent process of transformation structure and functional aspects of the state's political apparatus⁴⁵.

From the theoretical-methodological point of view we may summarize and argue that the modernization process can be interpreted as a combination of economic, political, social, cultural and other systematic transformations in various spheres of social life. The basic constituents of the modernization process are political, social-economic and system modernization. From the practical point of view, it can be favorably shown by the example of the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe, which are notable for their peculiarities and differences in comparison with countries which do not have communistic past. However, the key characteristic of such differences is in carrying out not one, but several complicated simultaneous "transitions" and logistic stages of modernization – introduction of pluralistic political system, market economy and new model of sovereignty. In the context of the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe in due time it was presupposed and amplified not only by the necessity of simultaneous implementation of a number of set logistic tasks, but also by the fact that future of such "composed" reformation greatly depends on plausibility and real chances to combine the goals which are different in their nature. Consequently, the majority of the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe succeeded in achieving their modernization aim, joining the EU and being transformed into consolidated democracies. Notably, the prospects of entering the EU became a counter-force, which managed to neutralize the "dilemma of simultaneity" and refute the "theorem of impossibility" of a modernization process, becoming for the countries of the region quite a significant circumstance within the process of modernization and democratization transformations.

Experience has proven that it was represented in various sectors of social systems in Central-Eastern European countries, though it took place at different pace, but with the identical vector. First of all, in political and political-constitutional sphere the system of socialistic state and law was finally liquidated, and the basis of a law-governed state, political pluralism and democracy were instituted, the process of civil servant screening for corruption in the institutional power, law enforcement authorities, system of local governance was commenced, new constitutions and legislations were adopted. New political elites in the countries of Central-Eastern Europe not just declared inconvertibility of changes, but adhered to the chosen reformatory line. What's more, it referred both to right and left political forces, as among their representatives there weren't any divergences in views as to the main vector of national development, however, some specific steps towards democratic reforms could sometimes provoke acute discussions, caused a great deal of chaos into government actions, led to breakdowns of governmental coalitions and government resignations. Secondly, in the social-economic sphere the top-priority changes were: privatization, new forms of ownership, new structuring of the spheres of national economy, as well as new legislative base, which constituted a legal field for market mechanisms

⁴⁵ Myronenko P., *Forma pravlinnia: politychni transformatsii na zlomi stolit: monografiiia*, Wyd. Akademiia 2014, s. 95.

functioning. Thirdly and finally, in the sphere of social and cultural life it was represented in the following processes: liquidation of monopoly on power and social processes, reformation of civil, commercial and other legislations and their adjustment to western European standards. Therefore, in the course of modernization in the post-communist countries of Central-Eastern Europe in general, one could find the essential connection between the political, social-economic and system logistics of transformations, which in total became a “revolution” in the context of fundamental breaking social and social-political models.

References

1. Acuna C., Smith W., *The Political Economy of Structural Adjustment: The Logic of Support and Opposition to Neoliberal Reform*, [w:] Smith W., Acuña C., Gamarra E. (eds.), *Latin American Political Economy in the Age of Neoliberal Reform*, Wyd. University of Miami 1994.
2. Armijo L., Bierkster T., Lowenthal A., *The Problems of Simultaneous Transitions*, [w:] Diamond L., Plattner M. (eds.), *Economic Reform and Democracy*, Wyd. Johns Hopkins University Press 1995.
3. Åslund A., The Case for Radical Reform, *Journal of Democracy* 1994, vol 5, nr. 4, s. 63–74.
4. Bunce V., Comparing East and South, *Journal of Democracy* 1995, vol 6, nr. 3, s. 87–100.
5. Crawford B., Lijphart A., Explaining Political and Economic Change in Post-Communist Eastern Europe: Old Legacies, New Institutions, Hegemonic Norms and International Pressures, *Comparative Political Studies* 1995, vol 28, nr. 2, s. 171–199.
6. Dutch R., Tolerating Economic Reform: Popular Support for Transition to a Free Market in the Former Soviet Union, *American Political Science Review* 1993, vol 87, nr. 3, s. 590–608.
7. Dziundziuk V., Kotukov O., Radchenko O., *Politychna modernizatsiia: teoriia ta istoriia: metod. rek. dlia slukhachiv usikh form navch.*, Wyd. NADU 2011.
8. Ekiert G., Kubik J., *Strategies of Collective Protest in Democratizing Societies: Hungary, Poland and Slovakia since 1989*, 10-th International Conference of Europeanists Buklet, Chicago 1996.
9. Elster J., *The Necessity and Impossibility of Simultaneous Political and Economic Reforms*, [w:] Ploszajski P. (ed.), *Philosophy of Social Choice*, Wyd. IFiS Publishers 1991, s. 309–316.
10. Encarnacion O., The Politics of Dual Transitions, *Comparative Politics* 1996, vol 28, nr. 4, s. 477–492.
11. Ingkharth R., Postmodern: menyayushchiesya tsennosti i izmenyayushchiesya obshchestva, „Polis“ 1997, vol 4, s. 6–32.
12. Lathyina N., Demokratyzatsiia v krainakh Tsentralnoi ta Skhidnoi Yevropy: riznomanitni pidkhody y universalni oznaky, „Naukovi zapysky IPiEND im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy“ 2008, vol 37, s. 233–244.
13. Linz J., Transitions to Democracy, *Washington Quarterly* 1990, vol 13, nr. 3, s. 143–164.
14. Myronenko P., *Forma pravlinnia: politychni transformatsii na zlomi stolit: monohrafiia*, Wyd. Akademiia 2014.
15. Novakova O., *Politychna modernizatsiia ta rozvytok demokratychnykh protsesiv v suchasni Ukraini*: avtooref. dys... dokt. polit. nauk: spets. 23.00.02 – politychni instytuty ta protsesy, Kyiv 2007.
16. Novakova O., *Politychnyi protses: sutnist, zmist ta suchasni tendentsii rozvytku*, Wyd. Elton-2 2010.

17. Offe C., Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory Facing the Triple Transition in East Central Europe, *"Social Research"* 1991, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 865–892.
18. Offe C., Das Dilemma der Gleichzeitigkeit. Demokratisierung und Marktwirtschaft in Osteuropa, *"Merkur"* 1991, vol 4, s. 279–292.
19. Ost D., *Labor, Class and Democracy: Shaping Political Antagonisms in Post-Communist Society*, [w:] Crawford B. (ed.), *Markets, States and Democracy: The Political Economy of Post-Communist Transformation*, Wyd. Westview Press 1995.
20. *Politycheskie instituty na rubezhe tysyachelety*, Wyd. OOO "Feniks" 2001.
21. Roeder P., The Revolution of 1989: Postcommunism and the Social Science, *"Slavic Review"* 1999, vol 58, nr. 4, s. 743–755.
22. Seleni I., Stroitelstvo kapitalizma bez kapitalistov – tri puti perehoda ot sotsializma k kapitalizmu, *"Russkie chteniya"* 2006, vol 3 (yanvar-iyun 2006 g.).
23. Tomanevych L., Sotsioekonomichna modernizatsiia yak chynnyk staloho rozvytku ekonomiky Ukrainy, *"Naukovyi visnyk Lvivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu veterynarnoi medytsyny ta biotekhnologii im. Gzhytskoho"* 2013, vol 15, nr. 2, s. 361–367.
24. Weintraub J., *Democracy and the Market. A Marriage of Inconvenience*, [w:] Nugent M. (ed.), *From Leninism to Freedom. The Challenges of Democratization*, Wyd. Boulder 1992.