



REVISTA INCLUSIONES

HOMENAJE A ROSA MARÍA VALLES RUIZ

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número Especial

Abril / Junio

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile

Subdirectores

Mg © Carolina Cabezas Cáceres

Universidad de Las Américas, Chile

Dr. Andrea Mutolo

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Brasil

Drdo. Maicon Herverton Lino Ferreira da Silva

Universidade da Pernambuco, Brasil

Editor Europa del Este

Dr. Aleksandar Ivanov Katrandzhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Traductora: Portugués

Lic. Elaine Cristina Pereira Menegón

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dra. Carolina Aroca Toloza

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Mg. Keri González

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Mg. Cecilia Jofré Muñoz

Universidad San Sebastián, Chile

Mg. Mario Lagomarsino Montoya

Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanesio

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Dra. Patricia Virginia Moggia Münchmeyer

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Mg. David Ruete Zúñiga

Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, Chile

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra
Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz
Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov
South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía
Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu
Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie
Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar
Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo
Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, México

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto
Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo
Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandia
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar
Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau
Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg
Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez
Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire
Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera
Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre
Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

Dr. Miguel León-Portilla
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura
Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel", España

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros
Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández
Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango
Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut
Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa
Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Honduras

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Mg. Paola Aceituno

Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, Chile

Ph. D. María José Aguilar Idañez

Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, España

Dra. Elian Araujo

Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Rumyana Atanasova Popova

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa

Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal

Centro de Estudos Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Alina Bestard Revilla

*Universidad de Ciencias de la Cultura Física y el
Deporte, Cuba*

Dra. Noemí Brenta

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel

Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik

Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec

INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant

Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalén, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro

Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Dra. Claudia Lorena Fonseca

Universidad Federal de Pelotas, Brasil

Dra. Ada Gallegos Ruiz Conejo

Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Perú

Dra. Carmen González y González de Mesa

Universidad de Oviedo, España

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez

Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Patricio Quiroga

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio

Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú

**REVISTA
INCLUSIONES**
REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Carlos Manuel Rodríguez Arrechavaleta
Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. Vivian Romeu
Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. María Laura Salinas
Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dr. Stefano Santasilia
Universidad della Calabria, Italia

Mg. Silvia Laura Vargas López
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, México

**CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA
EDITORIAL**

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dr. Evandro Viera Ouriques
Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro, Brasil

Dra. María Luisa Zagalaz Sánchez
Universidad de Jaén, España

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec
Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía
Santiago – Chile
Representante Legal
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF
SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad
de Concepción

BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN



**SOCIO-ECONOMIC MODERNIZATION OF TECHNOGENIC SOCIETY:
BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT**

Ph. D. (C) Sergei Igorevich Pelevin

Armavir State Pedagogical University, Russian Federation
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3415-752X
pelevin17@gmail.com

Dr. Yerazak Manapovich Tileubergenov

Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Republic of Kazakhstan
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6584-3103
etm61@mail.ru

Dr. Alexey Mikhailovich Vasiliev

East Siberian Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, Russian Federation
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4399-1540
alexey771977@mail.ru

Fecha de Recepción: 21 de diciembre de 2019 – **Fecha Revisión:** 27 de enero de 2020

Fecha de Aceptación: 18 de marzo de 2020 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de abril de 2020

Abstract

When technogenic society is studied, it is often referred to developing and modernizing countries that are undergoing transitional socio-economic processes and go through the stages of radical transformation of political structures. At the same time, it is often overlooked that the developed Western states also went through periods of modernization, which included evolutionary and revolutionary transformations. Nowadays, despite the presence of a relatively stable technogenic political system, from time to time they have to undergo socio-economic and political-institutional changes, sometimes even of a crisis nature. American political scientists B. Brown and R. Macridis note that "political change is not limited to developing countries". All technogenic societies undergo a fairly rapid evolution, including those that are commonly called developed industrial countries, since any political process is closely linked to changes.

Keywords

Technogenic society – Politics – Development – Social development – Democracy

Para Citar este Artículo:

Pelevin, Sergei Igorevich; Tileubergenov, Yerazak Manapovich y Vasiliev, Alexey Mikhailovich. Socio-economic modernization of technogenic society: background and development. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 300-311.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported
(CC BY-NC 3.0)

Licencia Internacional



PH. D. (C) SERGEI IGOREVICH PELEVIN / DR. YERAZAK MANAPOVICH TILEUBERGENOV
DR. ALEXEY MIKHAILOVICH VASILIEV

Introduction

It is difficult to imagine a country, even the most stable one, in which there would be no institutional changes. These can be changes related to both smooth evolution and reform, and radical social breakdown during the revolution. In addition, political changes are mainly of the so-called “non-linear” nature and are far from being associated with social progress and the forward movement of society. Serious political deviations are possible: the collapse of democratic regimes, for example, in Germany and Italy, where the Nazis came to power in the 1920-30s. But most often, in political life, peculiar combinations of “regressive” and “progressive” changes arise. Thus, it can be assumed that the category of “political change” in the broad sense covers almost all changes known in human history in political structures and state institutions¹.

At the same time, a number of theoretical and methodological questions arise. Firstly, what is the correlation of the concepts “change” and “development”, “transition” and “transformation” in politics? Secondly, what is the social nature and institutional nature of political change? And thirdly, what are the features of political changes in developed and stable countries, on the one hand, and the specifics of political transformations in developing and modernizing countries, on the other hand².

In modern political science, the problems of political changes have been especially actively developed since the 1950-60s under the influence of decolonization processes and the formation of independent third world states. But the origins of reflection on transitional processes and changes in political life are rooted in the depths of centuries. For example, as early as the 19th century, A. de Tocqueville in his works, “Democracy in America” and “The Old Regime and Revolution,” substantiates the idea of reproducing some authoritarian governance mechanisms when transforming the obsolete “ancient regime” structures into democratic institutions³.

A logical question arises: how to define the generic concept of “political change” itself. Firstly, political change is a specific type of social change, associated primarily with changes in the mechanism of power regulation of society. Political change bears the most general sociological characteristics of any social change, but of course, it is not limited to them.

Secondly, political changes are associated with the transformation within institutional structures or with their qualitative replacement due to transformations of the social environment (economic and spiritual-cultural changes, shifts and balance of social forces, etc.) As a result, it is possible to formulate the following working definition of the analyzed concept: political change is a transformation of political institutions associated with shifts in the balance of social actors, with a change in their potentials and positional alignment of political forces which are caused by economic, spiritual, cultural, international and non-social factors. We have already considered the general structure of the life of political institutions, which includes three main components: the ideal model (institutional design, which includes norms and values); the communication process (multilateral interactions); and the organized, structurally hierarchical community of people. In his turn

¹ Political Corruption Law & Definition (US: Legal, 2016).

² C. Gibson, From inspiration to participation: A review of perspectives on youth civic engagement (Grantmaker Forum on Community & National Service, 2011).

³ A. G. Nold, Engaging the Nation's Youth in Politics. 2010.

P. Štompka believes that social changes occur at the following elementary levels of the “socio-cultural field”:

- 1) ideas (ideologies, theories, etc.);
- 2) norms and values;
- 3) interactions and organizational relationships;
- 4) interests and statuses.

Literature Review

The question of the importance of the institutional structure for political changes and its external environment is considered through two main approaches: “contextual” and “institutional” ones. They differ in distinguishing the “leading” and “guided” roles for these determinants and the corresponding mechanisms for determining the changes that take place.

The first approach is associated with the idea of the “primary” role of the “social context”, “external environment”, that is, the socio-economic, socio-cultural and other conditions of all the unfolding political and institutional changes. Due to this fact, there can be no serious political changes, for example, without a definite change in the level and pace of economic development. It is rather curious that within the broad framework of this approach, the positions of Marxist (Western Marxism) and non-Marxist authors (R. Aron, R. Dahl, B. Russet, S. Lipset, and others) are intertwined. The Marxist paradigm of political change proceeds from the idea of their determination by the economic basis of society (primarily, production relations) with relative independence and the active role of a political superstructure (e.g. state). According to the Marxist logic, the mode of production and the form of ownership ultimately determine the class structure and alignment of social forces, which, in accordance with their material and economic interests, in turn, determine the direction of changes in political organizations (states, parties, etc.). Non-economic, spiritual and cultural factors therefore play a “secondary”, subordinate role⁴. Western liberal political analysts take slightly different positions; they also take into account the dynamics and levels of socio-economic development when determining the causes and nature of political changes in developed or developing countries. For example, at the end of the 1950s, S. Lipset raised the question of the dependence of the formation of democratic institutions on the level of economic development and the rate of industrial growth, noting that “the more a nation succeeds economically, the more chances it has to become a democratic nation”. To justify this thesis, S. Lipset draws on such socio-economic indicators as the level of gross national product per capita, the quality of education, the degree of urbanization, industrialization, etc. Comparing the dynamics of the democratization of political institutions in 113 countries of the world in the early 90s, he, together with two co-authors, concluded that the country's economic development, high level of gross national product (GNP) per capita are inextricably linked with the country's political democratization⁵.

⁴ E. Bethke, “Political children”, *The review of education/pedagogy/cultural Studies*, Vol: 23 num 2 (2011): 111-136.

⁵ A. Carlson; M. Gallager; K. Lieberthal and M. Manion, *Chinese Politics: New Sources, Methods, and Field Strategies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Following S. Lipset and his colleagues, it is possible to consider the fact that the specific indicators of authoritarian regimes are reduced in proportion to the increase in GNP per capita. If we compare the economic indicators of countries of the “below” and “above average” levels, it is easy to notice that the number of countries with a “non-free” (authoritarian) regime is proportionally decreasing, while the number of countries with a “free” (democratic) regime is increasing. At the same time, the idea of the economic conditionality of political change is often placed in doubt⁶. As a Russian political scientist, A.M. Sashin, noted, “changes in the social and economic order, even those that we perceive as qualitative ones, do not necessarily lead to qualitative changes in the political system and political culture. The state is not dismantled and put together each time in response to these changes; it evolves, grows, degrades, and sometimes does all these together”.

The socio-cultural dynamics is also an important factor determining political changes in various countries. Changes in political relations and state institutions are affected by religious, moral, ideological, and ethno-psychological values and traditions. A French political scientist, J. Blondel, noted that after World War II, the colonial countries that survived British cultural influence adapted to democratic institutions faster than the states that were colonies of France, Portugal, the Netherlands or Belgium. For the country's political changes, a large role is played by the degree of its “cultural secularization” (G. Almond, D. Powell), which is related to the proportion between beliefs and institutions, rational-analytical and irrationally-affective components of the country's population's assessment of certain political reforms, government events, etc.

The institutional approach to the analysis of the nature and mechanism of determining political changes transfers emphasis from their “external environment” to the “internal” structure of political life and state institutions (S. Huntington, T. Skocpol, D. March, and others). One of the most serious attempts to explain the nature of political changes by analyzing their institutional mechanisms was made in S. Huntington's famous study, “Political Order in Changing Societies” (1968). Here, political institutions are presented as a form of moral consensus, organized coordination of interests and connection on this basis of the lines of behavior of various social actors, the balance of power between which is constantly changing. Various fluctuations in the external and social environment, economic crises and social unrest are possible, but all these depend on the efficiency and adaptive reaction of institutional mechanisms, their strength and ability to govern the country, and maintain stability in it. Therefore, the nature and success of social change primarily depend on the level of political institutionalization of the country.

S. Huntington puts forward a rather original concept according to which, in each country, political stability (or instability) is determined, on the one hand, by the ratio of the pace of social mobilization, the degree of civic participation, and, on the other hand, with the pace of institutionalization and optimization of the level of organization. In developing countries, institutional changes are constantly lagging behind economic changes (industrialization, urbanization, etc.) and, accordingly, behind the growth rates of social mobilization and political participation of the population. S. Huntington noted that “political stability, as we have proved, depends on the attitude of institutionalization towards participation. If political participation grows, then it is necessary to strengthen the

⁶ G. Almond; G. Powell; K. Strom and R. Dalton, Comparative politics today: A world view (Moscu: Aspect Press, 2014).

complexity, autonomy, adaptability, and integrativity of the political institutions of society in order to maintain political stability". At the same time, S. Huntington introduced the criteria of institutionalization of politics. These criteria determine the level of development and the degree of effectiveness of various institutions that he placed in four dichotomous oppositions: "adaptability-rigidity"; "complexity-simplicity"; "autonomy-subordination", and "integrativity-disunity". Further, this allowed the author to assess the nature and vector of political changes in the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Methodology

The changes in state institutions can be carried out quite autonomously from their social and economic conditions, despite the significant role of the latter. A Harvard University professor, T. Skocpol, substantiated this basic idea in the monograph "States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China" (1979), proving by the three great revolutions (French Revolution in 1789, Russian Revolution in 1917, and Chinese Revolution in 1949) that in the era of acute political crises, it is precisely the new state bodies, autonomous mainly from class control "from below", that play the role of subjects of basic socio-political changes. In all three revolutions, political leaders anticipated and then tried to implement revolutionary changes primarily through the capture and use of state bodies, followed by the general consolidation of the administrative-bureaucratic regime. Thus, the leading role of the subject of such political changes was played by the elite and the bureaucracy that relied on the control of the main institutions of state power⁷.

Political changes are categorized on various grounds, from which you can choose the four most common options: 1) intentional and spontaneous, evolutionary and catastrophic, revolutionary and reformation changes; 2) sustainable and unsustainable changes, for example, intra-systemic, reproductive, and transitional ones; 3) "progressive" and "regressive" changes that eventually lead to social degradation or economic stagnation; 4) institutional and eventual changes. Let us dwell on a brief description of each of these oppositions, expressing certain essential features and trends of political changes.

The fundamental distinction between intentional and spontaneous political changes, the axis of "revolution-reform" is a striking example of it. Revolutions differ from reforms in a number of ways. Firstly, revolutions affect all aspects of society from economy and the social sphere to culture, ideology and psychology. This is because revolutions are associated with extreme forms of social activity of the masses, the spontaneous deployment of the systemic crisis of society. Separate political reforms are not of such a deep and comprehensive nature; they affect only some aspects of political life, for example, the zemstvo reform of 1864 planned in Russia by the tsarist government in Russia. Secondly, revolutions are often associated with the use of methods of radical coercion and open violence, while reforms are intentionally and consciously carried out in most cases by legal and peaceful means. Thirdly, revolutions are quick, spasmodic, and explosive by nature, while reforms are most often gradual, and their implementation sometimes stretches over many years. Finally, revolutions are necessarily associated with the changes in the very foundations of the system of political power, but reforms do not always affect them. At the same time, the lines between reforms and revolutions are

⁷ J. C. Chaturvedy, Political Governance: Political theory (Isha Books, 2014).

sometimes very flexible⁸. The examples include political changes in the countries of Eastern Europe in the late 1980s-early 1990s after the fall of communist regimes; they comprise both revolutionary transformations and a series of structural reforms of public administration and local self-government.

Another boundary in the typologization of political changes lies along the lines of “intrasystemic” or “transit” transformations. This approach reveals a different side of political changes, namely, the attitude to the system of institutions and basic norms which form a kind of “frame” of any state. The first type of processes takes place on such a political field, where, figuratively speaking, as in chess or football, the number of players and judges (institutes) is quite strictly defined; the time, procedures and rules of the game are stipulated (political and legal norms)⁹. This is applied to countries in which a stable political system has crystallized, democratic or totalitarian one, in the “Procrustean bed” of which any political change is unfolding, reproducing at the same time the old roles of actors and the functions of institutions (for example, a seventy-year period in France of the Third Republic). The second type includes political changes in those countries that are undergoing a period of total change in the entire system of power and its institutions, as was the case in Russia after February 1917. The very field of the theory of political change associated with the studies of transitional processes and with the radical transformation of political institutions is designated by the term “transitology” in modern political science.

The third major division of political changes is largely connected with value orientations and axiological criteria, with the help of which the social “vector” of political changes, their “progressive” or “regressive” character, are evaluated. This type of typologization largely depends on a number of reference points, usually shared by most political scientists, that is, axiological criteria for positive, progressive, or negatively regressive changes in political life. It was not so long ago when in Russian social science literature, all political transformations in our country and abroad were evaluated only from the standpoint of their correspondence to the “interests of the working class” and the “tasks to build a communist society”¹⁰. Today, we can meet almost the same one-sided criterion in political assessments, but with a diametrically opposite vector of correspondence of any guidelines for social changes with the values and patterns of liberal, mainly American, democracy. In his famous article “The End of History?”¹¹ F. Fukuyama directly pointed to this way of assessing the positive or progressive nature of any political changes at any period, anywhere in the world, but only in the context of the “triumph of the West”, since “history has ended as such, the ideological evolution of mankind and universalization of Western liberal democracy as the ultimate form of government has been completed”. One cannot but doubt the categorical nature of such a judgment, in spite of all the value of the liberal democratic tradition of the West, when the way to assess diverse political changes in dozens of countries that differ greatly in socio-cultural and ethnic conditions is reduced to this homogeneous criterion¹².

⁸ European Absolutism And Power Politics (International World History Project, 1998).

⁹ C. Gibson, From inspiration to participation: A review of perspectives on youth civic engagement. (Grantmaker Forum on Community & National Service, 2011).

¹⁰ L. Grinin; A. Korotayev y A. Tausch, Economic Cycles, Crises, and the Global Periphery. Springer International Publishing, Heidelberg (New York, Dordrecht, London, 2016). Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/>

¹¹ J. Painter y J. Alex, Political Geography (London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2009.)

¹² D. J. Levinson, Conservatism and radicalism (International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 2016).

Finally, the last criterion makes it possible to separate “quantitative” accumulations, event changes, and conflict situations between political actors that do not lead to institutional changes from “qualitative” shifts in the institutional structure due to a radical change in the general distribution of social forces. The search for such criteria by political scientists is necessary to evaluate political transformations in various states. Indeed, as it was already mentioned, not every political change is uniquely positively progressive in nature (fascism, totalitarian communism, etc.).¹³

What is the difference between states that are able to maintain stability and overcome crisis trends through innovation and reforms and countries experiencing permanent and systemic crises leading to coups and upheavals, uprisings and civil wars? There are a number of political, socio-economic and socio-cultural factors that determine these differences, for example, the role of traditions and customs of finding consensus and compromises, or the use of force in the event of a disagreement between competing actors.

At the same time, in modern political science literature, a significant place in explaining the successes of Western democracies is occupied by institutional mechanisms of maintaining stability. However, it should be borne in mind that political stability can be reproduced not only in democratic, but sometimes in totalitarian countries. For more than seven decades of the existence of the USSR, the political regime periodically evolved in the direction of some liberalization (from Stalin to Khrushchev, from Brezhnev to Gorbachev), providing at a certain moment a fairly high level of institutional stability (reproduction of a well-known set of social functions by state institutions such as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League, and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council).

This tendency was noticed by S. Huntington, who back in the late 1960s distinguished political systems not by traditional types of political regimes, but by the level of stability, organizational “strength”, and the degree of stability of institutions that regulate political dynamics. Analyzing the conditions for the effective maintenance of political order during rapid social changes, he noted that “the differences between democracy and dictatorship are smaller than the differences between those countries in which there is consensus, unity, legality, organization, efficiency, stability, and those countries whose policies lack these features.”¹⁴ Both communist totalitarian states and Western liberal states are more likely to be described as strong rather than weak political systems. The United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union have different forms of government, but in all three systems the government does govern. These governments take advantage of the loyalty of their citizens and therefore manage tax resources, can use human resources, innovate and implement policies. According to S. Huntington, that is how the stable political dynamics in the “first” and “second” world countries (at the end of the 1960s) differed from the unstable and uneven rhythm of political changes in most developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America¹⁵.

¹³ P. Osborne y C. Matthew, Walter Benjamin. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Stanford: California: Stanford University, 2015).

¹⁴ L. Grinin; A. Korotayev y A. Tausch, Economic Cycles, Crises, and the Global Periphery (Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer International Publishing, 2016). Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/>

¹⁵ A. Ryan, On Politics: A History of Political Thought from Herodotus to the Present (London: Allen Lane, 2012).

Apparently, the collapse of the USSR and the transformation of the former communist countries noticeably adjusted the conclusions about their level of stability, but perhaps they had certain grounds for a specific period of post-war political development. At the same time, as H. Arendt noted, temporary stabilization in totalitarian regimes is achieved through ideological coercion and political violence, and in general, the stability of totalitarian rule contradicts its social nature. External stability and the “unity of the party and people” during the period of “great terror” in the USSR in the late 1930s, for example, rested on a constant struggle against “objective class enemies” inside and outside the country. Later at the turn of the 1970s and 1980s, in USSR, a different form of “stability” has developed – the so-called political and economic “stagnation” that prepared the catastrophic collapse of the USSR in the early 1990s.

The sustainable economic growth and the relative effectiveness of a number of political transformations in the developed and democratic countries of the West are explained by political scientists with various reasons, depending on the position of the researcher. The representatives of rather “new” institutionalism, which is quite influential in modern social science, attribute the successes of Western democracies primarily to the effective political institutions that adequately reproduce their basic functions and flexibly adapt to changing social circumstances.

An American scientist, D. North, defining institutions as a system of formal rules, informal norms and their implementing mechanisms of communication between people, raises the question of the reasons for choosing different directions of institutional changes, starting from the 16th century, from the two leading powers for that time – Spain and England. At first, there was a similarity of social problems and political structures in these countries: royal power and bureaucracy, legislative and representative bodies arise next to it: parliament and cortes (courts), in which different “rules of the game” were formed. In the 17th century Great Britain, under the Tudors, a tripartite agreement was reached between the crown, parliament and merchants, by which the parliament expanded its rights in exchange for the introduction of new taxes.

This difference is based on two systems of rules of political communication, which have developed over decades and even centuries: in the North – “horizontal” civic solidarity and mutual trust, in the South of Italy – “vertical” non-civilian clientelism and mutual isolation. This allowed the North of Italy to carry out institutional and economic reforms much more effectively than the backward regions of the South. As R. Putnam wrote, “For at least ten centuries, the North and the South of Italy used different approaches to the dilemmas of collective action. In the North, the norms of reciprocity and structures of civic engagement are embodied in “tower societies”, guilds, mutual aid societies, cooperatives, trade unions, sports and even library clubs”. These horizontal civic ties made it possible to achieve higher levels of economic and institutional activity compared with the South. This laid the foundation for a stable institutional and sustainable economic development. Let us consider in more detail the very concept “sustainable development”.

In the most general sense of the word “development” means a type of change in objects that has a certain direction, and an irreversible, regular character. In recent years, the concept of sustainable development has gained considerable popularity in political science and sociology. What is the meaning of the concept of “sustainable development” of a democratic state? The countries of sustainable political development, as noted above, include primarily the Western democracies of Europe, North America, Australia, etc.

Democratic development becomes sustainable only when there is a flexible and adaptive institutional structure, able to resolve social conflicts, but strong and rigid enough to withstand their escalation. At the same time, A. Przeworski adds, in order to maintain sustainable development, it is essential that all the main political forces choose a pluralistic institutional system for expressing their interests and value orientations, which will make it possible to reach the relative agreement necessary for the development and implementation of the reform strategy by the government. Thus, the process of political transformation in the developed capitalist countries plays a significant role in the development of an adequate state strategy, with reduced spontaneity and uncertainty threshold of social change.

Such examples include socio-economic changes, political innovations and reforms carried out in two Anglo-Saxon states of the Old (Great Britain) and New (USA) Worlds. In Great Britain, in the 1980s the conservative government of M. Thatcher was faced with a crisis caused by the technological restructuring of production, which in the middle of the decade led to massive unemployment of 3.2 million people (more than 12% of the country's workforce). By radically rebuilding the social security system, the Tory government gradually achieved a turning point in structural reforms by the beginning of the 1990s, retained a number of social stabilizers and spent considerable resources on this. The expenditures for public needs during the reign of M. Thatcher's cabinet sometimes exceeded 50% of the country's gross national income, while their maximum under the Laborites was only 46%. Despite the destabilizing factors that accompanied the Tory's tough economic strategy, the political system of Great Britain (the pendulum of the bipartisan system, etc.) had survived the social transformations and structural reorganization of the country's economy by the beginning of the 1990s. At the same time, political transformation in the "most stable country" was undoubtedly actively unfolding, as evidenced by the creation of autonomous parliaments in Scotland and Wales in the late 1990s after the advent of the Labor government of T. Blair, who proposed a course towards a certain decentralization of a number of institutions of power.

Let us consider another "model" option for ensuring political stability – more than two hundred years of experience simultaneously maintaining stability and carrying out institutional reforms in the United States. In this country, the initiative to carry out various political and administrative changes alternately came mainly from either the Congress or the President. It is noteworthy that in the United States there was a long tradition of introducing the institutionalized way of political changes from above through administrative and legal reforms, the adoption of legislative acts establishing new "rules of the game". Moreover, this tradition worked even in times of crisis, war or depression. Important stabilization mechanisms in American political dynamics include: 1) systems of separation of powers, horizontal "checks and balances" (between the President, Congress and the US Supreme Court); 2) relative decentralization and a clear vertical separation of powers (between federal authorities, states and regional local structures); 3) the "pendulum", bipolar system of regrouping of two main political parties (Democrats and Republicans); 4) certain civilian control and pressure "from below" through the use of elections, self-government, the media, public organizations and movements, etc.

At the end of the 18th century, the United States' Founding Fathers (A. Hamilton, J. Madison and others) tried to develop a kind of "golden ratio", or a formula containing the optimal proportion between stability and variability in public policy. In a sense, they were able to formulate the general principles of such an "optimum," which allowed the United States for decades to maintain the sustainable nature of political development. J. Madison

emphasized in the “Federalist Papers” that state power, on the one hand, must constantly respond and adapt to the changing demands of the people, gaining authority from it and being dependent on it. However, on the other hand, “sustainability in governing requires that the same hands hold power for a long time. Frequent elections would lead to a frequent change of the elected, and frequent changes of the elected would lead to a frequent change of measures; whereas, the government must use power and, moreover, exercise it with one pair of hands to gain strength. The members of the Senate elected for 6 years were also called upon to neutralize certain excessively fast actions and radical innovations of the executive branch carried out under direct pressure from the people.¹⁶

Conclusions

The orthodox provisions of the theory of political modernization were criticized and then reconsidered in the 1970s and 1980s. First of all, the provision on a strict sequence of phases of linear evolution was questioned (for example, the experience of the development of a number of “Asian dragons” demonstrated this). Secondly, the model of ethnocentric, “westernizing” modernization was criticized as well since many countries successfully combine traditional and modern institutional components (Japan). The claim of the modernization doctrine for universalism was critically evaluated; universalism implies that all states are moving in the direction of transition from heterogeneous to homogeneous, identical institutions of power. Thirdly, the mechanism for implementing the modernization strategy is far from being democratic both politically and economically. For example, Stalin's industrialization and collectivization in the USSR had a huge amount of social costs. As B. Moore wrote, the experience of seven decades of the 20th century confirms that non-democratic, often anti-democratic, methods of modernization are quite successfully imposed to solve state problems in a number of countries.

The following parameters were referred to the main characteristics of political modernization: 1) growing strong and centralized state power at the national level alongside weakening traditional sources of the tribal type; 2) the differentiation and specialization of political institutions; 3) the growing level of participation of the masses in politics.

Some of the above characteristics relate the theory of modernization to the concept of political development, which is understood in the narrow sense of the word as one of the directions of the general theory (or approach) of development (the developmental approach) associated primarily with institutional changes. What are these institutional changes that are not a simple consequence of economic development? The concept of political development focuses on the institutions of a political system and their transformation. These are the signs of political development that the former president of the American Political Science Association, L. Pye, noted. He defined political development as a process of change characterized, firstly, by an increase in the differentiation of political structures, secondly, by an increase in the system's ability to solve social problems and manage public affairs, and thirdly, by the development of citizens' participation and equality when engaged in politics.

¹⁶ Political Corruption Law & Definition (US: Legal, 2016).

Conflict of interest

The authors confirm that the data do not contain any conflict of interest.

References

Book

Alisson, G. Nold. Engaging the Nation's Youth in Politics. 2010.

Almond, G. y G. Powell, K. Strom and R. Dalton. Comparative politics today: A world view. Moscú: Aspect Press. 2014.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. How to Become a Political Scientist. 2016.

Carlson, A.; M. Gallagher, K. Lieberthal and M. Manion. Chinese Politics: New Sources, Methods, and Field Strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2010.

Chaturvedy, J. C. Political Governance: Political theory. Isha Books. 2014.

European Absolutism And Power Politics, International World History Project, 1998. Retrieved 22 April 2017.

Gibson, C. From inspiration to participation: A review of perspectives on youth civic engagement. Grantmaker Forum on Community&National Service. 2011

Levinson, D. J. Conservatism and radicalism. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. 2016

Osborne, P. y C. Matthew. Walter Benjamin. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Stanford, California: Stanford University. 2015.

Painter, J. y J. Alex. Political Geography. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. 2009.

Panarin, A. The temptation of globalism. Moscow: Eksmo-Press. 2014.

Petersen, M. B. The evolutionary psychology of mass politics. Applied Evolutionary Psychology. Oxford University Press. 2011.

Political Corruption Law & Definition. US Legal. 2016.

Putnam, R. Bowling alone. New York: Simon and Schuster. 2015.

Putnam, R. Soziales Kapital in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und in den USA. Bürgerlichen Engagement und Zivilgesellschaft. Opladen: Leske + Budrich. 2012.

Rauhala, E. North Korea Elections: A Sham Worth Studying Time magazine. 2014.

Ryan, A. On Politics: A History of Political Thought from Herodotus to the Present. London: Allen Lane. 2012.

Journal articles

Bethke, E. "Political children". The review of education/pedagogy/cultural Studies, Vol: 23 num 2 (2011): 111-136.

Robinson, E. H. "The Distinction Between State and Government". The Geography Compass, num 7 Vol: 8 (2013): 556-566.

Internet publications

Dictionary.com. Definition of Republic. 2017. Available at: <https://www.dictionary.com/>

Grinin, L. y A. Korotayev, A. Tausch. Economic Cycles, Crises, and the Global Periphery. Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer International Publishing. 2016. <https://www.nytimes.com/>

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo debe hacerse con permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**.

PH. D. (C) SERGEI IGOREVICH PELEVIN / DR. YERAZAK MANAPOVICH TILEUBERGENOV
DR. ALEXEY MIKHAILOVICH VASILIEV