

## LEADER AS A SUBJECT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS OF TRANSITION SOCIETY

Aleksey Radugin<sup>1</sup>, Boris Chernyshov<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Voronezh State Technical University, 84, 20-letiya Oktyabrya St.,  
Voronezh, Russia, E-mail: [aradugin@yandex.ru](mailto:aradugin@yandex.ru)

<sup>2</sup>Member of the State Duma of the Russian Federation, 1, Okhotny Ryad St., Moscow, Russia, E-  
mail: [borischernishov@gmail.com](mailto:borischernishov@gmail.com)

### Abstract

The authors' task is on the basis of the analysis of the theory and practice of modernization, to find out its essence and develop an optimal model of modernization policy for transition societies. The article shows that the theory of modernization formulated on the basis of the ideology of Eurocentrism serves as an ideological tool for imposing on the political leaders of transition societies the strategies of catching-up modernization of society based on the values of Western culture. The authors of the article prove that the political leaders of transition societies are able to develop their own original paradigm of social development - innovative self-development. The strategy of innovative self-development can be qualified as the third type of modernization policy. Its implementation by political leaders opens up wide opportunities for the development of transition societies on the principles of sovereignty.

**Keywords:** political leader, social transformation, modernization, transition society, innovative self-development.

### I. INTRODUCTION

The government institution has always played an important role in human society. Numerous aspects of social relations have contributed to the formation of a variety of ways of governing. One common way to govern is through political leadership. The role of political leaders in the countries of transition type is growing and becoming more complex to a significant degree. Each transition society faces the task of creating a developed market economy, a pluralistic political system, an efficiently functioning social system of support and development of human capital. In our opinion, it is possible to assess the character of the changes necessary in transitive societies on the basis of the concepts of "social transformation" and "modernization". Every national political leader in a transition society faces the challenge of transforming social life through modernization.

The purpose of this study is to find out the essence and develop an optimal model of modernization policy for transition societies basing on the analysis of the theory and practice of modernization.

### II. METHODOLOGY

The methodological research base is developed on the application of the following scientific methods: the

method of applying classical theories to the analysis of the phenomenon under consideration; historical analysis method - consideration of the studied subject in the perspective of chronological development; method of analysis and synthesis - the analytical foliation of the subject of study and subsequent synthesis in a comparative analysis of its individual parts; structural-functional method - consideration of the object of study (modernizing society) in the system-functional definitions.

### **III. DISCUSSION**

Political scientists D. Apter, S. Black, D. Lerner, M. Levy, J. O'Connell, Sh. Eisenstadt dealt with the problem of the study of modernization as a special type of social transformation. In their works, an attempt is made to conceptualize this notion. These authors interpret the process of changing one social form to another as an ascent to the most progressive model of modernization in Western Europe, copying and embedding these patterns in modernized countries. In such theories, the development process is seen as universal, which all "lagging" societies must go through. Based on this methodological approach, westernization and catching-up modernization models were developed. In the works of R. Bendix, B. Moore, K. Miller, V. A. Krasilshchikov., W. Zapf, V. G. Fedotova, P. Shtompka, S. Huntington, there is a redefining of the concept of modernization in the direction of recognizing the multi-vector nature of this process and the emergence of diverse forms of transforming societies [2, 3, 7, 10].

The development of the concept of modernization took place on the basis of the comparative analysis of modernizations of North America during the civil war period of the XIX century, India of the XX century during the rule of D. Nehru and I. Gandhi, Japan of the XIX century during the rule of Meiji, West Germany in the period of 1945-1960, China in the period of 1949-1976, post-communist countries of Eastern Europe in the period of 1989-2000, and at the present stage of development. As a result of the analysis, it was found that organic modernization represents a synchronization of development processes in various areas of society (social, economic, political, spiritual) [16].

### **IV. RESULTS**

**Modernization as a policy of social transformation.** At the beginning of our study, we will clarify what content is embedded into the concept of "social transformation". First of all, it should be noted that the concept of "social transformation" does not describe any process of social change, but only transitional ones in relation to any specific form of society. It means the process of changing the qualitative certainty of any social system, taken as a whole in the unity of its substantial foundations and functional activities. If we evaluate from the point of view of logic the content and volume of the concept of "social transformation", then the content of the concept of social transformation is a systematic change in this social quality, and volume is the boundary of the measure of its qualitative certainty. In accordance with the concept of I. Prigogin, the concept of social transformation expresses the transition to a qualitatively new state of the organization of society, which is carried out as a result of an increase in the proportion of non-equilibrium and non-linear relations with their environment. The conjugated internal changes in society, the sum of which at a certain point exceeds the stress limit acceptable for the system, forces the system as a whole to go over the stability threshold and move, depending on the circumstances, either into a chaotic state or a more

differentiated and higher level of development. As a process, social transformation is continuous with respect to the boundaries of the system and cumulative by the action of initiating foundations.

Social transformation occurs within the framework of social space and social time. In modern philosophy, social space is defined in two ways: objectively, as a changing social substance or social field, and procedurally, as a dynamically developing field (network) of social relations. Social substance is understood as social systems of various levels of structural organization, such as social institutions and social systems: states with their political organization, socio-economic formations, cultures and local civilizations. It is they that are involved in the processes of social changes, altering their coordinates in historical time and social space. The social field is understood as a system of spiritual relations that takes shape within the boundaries of a specific form of the human community under the influence of external and internal factors and, in its turn, is formed spontaneously or purposefully by the spiritual creativity of individuals and their collective associations that enter into interactive social cooperation. The nodal moment and source of social change as the content of social transformation is the interaction of the noted substances. In the parameters of material organization, a change means a replacement in the structures and functions of social systems of various levels of development, structural organization and the degree of complexity of the organic structure, within the boundaries of the social field, a change means shifts in social consciousness. The parameters of the historical time of social transformation are the boundaries of the existence of society as a particular level of the structural organization of human communities. With the exhaustion of the action of its backbone

foundations, transformation as a constant and universal process of changing directions and specific forms of movement of objects, processes and phenomena of the material world will inevitably change the quality and level of its structural organization.

The substantive basis of the process of social transformation is modernization of social systems. Let us take a closer look at what the term "modernization of social systems" implies. In socio-humane studies, the concept of "modernization of social systems" was developed in the framework of the theory of modernization. As you know, the theory of modernization was first formulated in the 50s-60s of the XX century by a US political scientist Samuel Black, as an alternative to the ideology of Afro-Asian traditionalism. According to a US sociologist E. Shils, "traditionalism is a conscious, deliberate affirmation of traditional norms with the full awareness of their traditional nature and the belief that their value is determined by traditional transmission from some sacred source" [12]. From the point of view of E. Shils, traditionalism is not only hostile to the liberal idea and all citizenship, but also hostile to the "indefinite, agile, tolerant tradition", which, by slowing down, ensures orderly development and evolutionary modernization of the world. Samuel Black contrasted the ideology of traditionalism with a new ideological construct in the form of a theory of modernization. Derived from French *modernization*, updating, *moderne* that is the newest, the term "modernization", means changing the object in accordance with the latest, modern requirements and standards. From the position of Black, modernization implies social, economic, political, environmental, demographic, psychological changes that a traditional type of society undergoes in the process of its transformation into a modern type of society. In this interpretation, the theory of modernization, having great explanatory possibilities, still did not satisfy the demands of the ideology of liberalism. In later studies, the ideas of S. Black were strengthened. So, in the works of researchers who share the methodology of progressivism, based on the principles laid down by the Age of Enlightenment, modernization appears as a self-legitimizing and self-justifying process of civilizational development, namely the formation of a new historical era - Art Nouveau. With this approach, it is believed that the person alone becomes responsible for his fate and directs their development towards increasing autonomy and individualization, and it is also assumed that the value system constituent Art Nouveau crystallizes in society, which manifests itself through reliance on individual freedoms, solidarity, active world shaping and universalism.

One of the most important processes of modernizing societies is the rationalization process, which, first of all, is characterized by the penetration of rational thinking into the world of social interactions. This penetration in the field of science is expressed in the desire for a rational explanation of facts and in reliance on experiment, in the economic field it manifests itself in the optimization of resources and increasing efficiency, in politics - in reliance on legitimate, law-based power, in public administration - rationalization occurs through the emergence of bureaucratic machinery based on the anonymous, automatic execution of functional operations, in private life, in organizing personal time, planning finances and other resources. According to Wolfgang Zapf, in this case, modernization is defined as development from a simple and poor agrarian society to a complex differentiated and rich industrial society, which to a certain extent has the ability of self-development and self-government. An even more specific formulation of modernization, emphasizing the connection between the processes of the Art Nouveau period and the ideas of the Age of Enlightenment, was given by the American researcher Richard Bendix, who understands modernization as a type of social transformations that originates in the English industrial revolution of 1760-1830, as well as in the political French revolution of 1789-1794. In his opinion, modernization was part in both the economic and political progress of some advanced countries, as well as in the subsequent changes in countries lagging behind. From these positions, modernization, being a progressive process, that is, aimed at achieving new, higher levels of development, is a systemic process. This means that as it develops, more and more changing dimensions are being included in this process, while economic, political, organizational, legal changes are in close interaction with changes in culture. Researchers also note that, these changes are of global nature. In our opinion, an important step in the development of the theory of modernization was made by two Dutch philosophers Van der Loo P. and Van Ryan V. in their study of the basic mechanisms and processes of modernization, published in 1997 under the title "Modernization. The Project and the Paradox" [15]. In this work, they describe modernization as a complex interaction of structural, cultural, mental and physical changes that have been actively manifested in the historical period of the last two centuries. At that, the world formed under the influence of these changes continues to develop and has a tendency to develop in a certain direction. As Dutch scientists have shown, modernization processes are not harmonious, as their individual components act upon each other in a way they do not necessarily support each other, moreover, they often come into conflict until they annihilate and overturn each other. The main merit of this study was to identify the complexity of modernization processes. The authors clearly showed the deep-seated contradictions not only at the level of practical implementation, but also revealed the theoretical regularity of the paradoxes of modernization processes.

The methodological function of the theory of modernization is, first of all, to offer political leaders of transition-type societies a specific development strategy that allows them to overcome the socio-economic and technological inferiority to developed countries and take their rightful place in the modern world. Moreover, on the basis of this theory, the political leaders of transition societies are offered two alternative development strategies: a) either reproduce the values of Western society, b) or develop their own original paradigm of social development. The first path is denoted by the concept of secondary, "catching-up modernization." Secondly, catching-up modernization, in the research literature, is interpreted as artificial bringing of any systems to a state that meets the standards and ideas of what is accepted in the modern world. Unlike primary, organic modernization, secondly, inorganic modernization does not begin with culture, but with economics and politics. It represents a response to an external challenge from more developed countries and is carried out by borrowing someone else's technology, political institutions, or the education system. Therefore, it is designated as "catching-up modernization". A catching-up modernization is an update of a society in accordance with the model. Of course, it is clear that the model should represent something more developed, more perfect than the subject being modernized. And the problem is this: will the object being upgraded ever be flush with the model? And is the modernizer interested in raising another one, a potential opponent, to his level? After all, the owner of an exemplary object has major advantages in time and independence. Politically, this model assumes a Western-type democratization of society, creating conditions for the manipulation of the popular masses, which acquires the status of an electorate, the ruling elite, which has great financial resources and also has the ability to manipulate the population through the mass media. Economically, this model assumes the denationalization of property and its privatization by a certain social group. Axiologically, the policy of catching-up modernization assumes that the political leader of a transition society adopts certain "modern standards" that he will try to follow, which, in essence, means unconditional acceptance of Western, values, consumption values at their core. This path presents the threat of conceal and loss of the state of a sense of ethno-national cultural identity by the government, society and citizens. Conceal and loss of sense of ethno-national cultural identity by the government, society and citizens of the state is fraught with the threat of losing the national sovereignty of states. This, in turn, means putting aside their own national interests, inability of these states to independent domestic and foreign policies. In our opinion, a society that has embarked on the path of catching-up modernization, at each stage of this process, should decide on the extent to which certain innovations are permissible. The limit of permissibility of innovations is associated with the preservation of ethno-national identity. However, the ideology and practice of "catching-up" modernization may appear to be not effective, because it comes from foreign and, what is more, cultural foundations alien to the national mentality. The liberal-democratic forms of power and economic relations introduced from the West cannot be realized in their originally conceived form. In the process of economic, political and other transformations of the country, it is necessary to take into account the special features of the country's cultural and historical experience, recognition of the priority of values, traditions and mentality of their own civilization. Therefore, in the process of modernization, it is necessary to strive to rely on the inherent national and cultural traditions in the formation of social relations. Supporters of the country's independent development path rightly point out that today its task is not to "become the West," but to make rational use of the special features of its own civilization, its huge sociocultural potential, in order to become an equal partner of the West. This purpose can be achieved when developing a strategy for the second development paths, different from the ideology of "catching-up modernization". This path is connected with the strategy of innovative development, which assumes reliance on the traditions of a particular society, that is, with the search for ways of sustainable civilizational development based on the basis of resurgence, maintenance and improvement of their own socio-cultural forms of life and their enrichment with new forms of life. Moreover, it is necessary to be open to cooperation in all areas of public life with all countries of the world community.

However, for successful innovative self-development, an appropriate hierarchy of basic values is necessary. Fundamental values should indicate not only the readiness of society for change, but also a fairly realistic idea of the purpose of the movement, and ways to achieve it. The determining factor for the process of innovative self-development is the ratio of traditional values and innovative structures, their close interaction, which allows to achieve greater harmony of social changes without losing systemic quality. In our opinion, the strategies of "catching-up modernization" and "innovative self-development" have both a number of similar features and a fundamental difference. The similarity between catching-up modernization and innovative self-development lies in the fact that both of these strategies imply coming to the fore of such subjective qualities as: thinking and conscious, future-oriented human activity. Neither catching-up modernization, nor innovative self-development takes place by themselves, in the mode of natural evolution: both of these require some willpower. The difference is that catching-up modernization involves pulling up to the well-known "world standards". On the contrary, innovative self-development is

conceived as based on criticism and problematization of already known methods, means, forms of self-organization and organization, ontological pictures. Innovative self-development is associated with the enrichment of the arsenal of intellectual work, and, accordingly, with the multiplication of the number of degrees of freedom, opportunities, diversification of thinking and activity, diversification and systematic change of resources used.

The positive experience of realizing the innovation development strategy was implemented by the political leaders in the 80s-90s of the XX century in the countries of Southeast Asia: in Japan, Singapore, South Korea, and at the end of the XX - early XXI in China. The analysis of the experience of the above-mentioned countries of the East showed that the internal engine of the modernization process is a combination of the achievements of modern science and traditional moral attitudes associated with the preservation of the best human qualities. Researchers are inclined to believe that the reason for the success in modernizing the countries of Southeast Asia lies in Confucianism. Confucianism, as a religious and ethical trend, is building a system of life values that is quite unusual for Europeans, giving preference to social recognition, honor, but not to material wealth. And high level of education, intelligence in the Confucian system of values is considered as the most important personality characteristics.

## V. CONCLUSION

Development of social processes sets the task of social transformation to the leaders of transition societies. The solution to this problem in political practice is based on the policy of modernization. Based on the socio-political practice of implementing the modernization policy, two of its main types can be identified: primary, endogenous, organic, intra-civilization modernization, and secondary, exogenous, inter-civilization, catching-up modernization. The first type of modernization was carried out in Western Europe and North America. The second type is recommended by the ideologists of the Western world and is imposed by politicians on transition societies. At that, on the basis of this theory, the political leaders of transition societies are offered two alternative development strategies: a) either reproduce the structures and values of Western society, b) or develop their own original paradigm of social development - innovative self-development. The strategy of innovative self-development can be qualified as the third type of modernization policy. Its implementation by political leaders opens up wide opportunities for the development of transition societies on the principles of sovereignty.

## REFERENCE LIST

1. Bendix R. (1967) Tradition and modernity reconsidered. *Hague. Comparative studies in society and history. Vol. 9. № 1.* Pp. 55-67. (in English).
2. David E. Apter (1967) The politics of modernization. *Chicago.* 481 p. (in English).
3. Eisenstadt Sh. N. (1966) Modernization: protest and change. *New York.* 166 p. (in English).
4. Fedotova V.G. (2010) Social innovations: macro and microtrends. *Questions of philosophy. № 10.* Pp. 3-17. (in Russian).
5. Huntington S. (2003) The Clash of Civilizations. *M.* 603 p.(in Russian).
6. Krasilshchikov V.A. (1994) Modernization: foreign experience and Russia. *M.* 115 p. (in Russian).
7. Levy M. Jr. (1966) Modernization and the Structure of Societies: A Setting for International Affairs. *Princeton.* 880 p. (in English).
8. Meshcheryakov A.N. (2006) Emperor Meiji and his Japan. *M.* 464 p. (in Russian).
9. Moore B. (1967) Social origins of dictatorship and democracy. Lord and peasant in the making of modern world. *Boston.* 760 p. (in English).
10. O'Connel J. (1976) The Concept of modernization. *New York. Black Comparative Modernization.* 205 p. (in English).
11. Perkins J. (1999) Restoration and Renewal? West Germany since 1945. *Contemporary European History. Vol. 8 (3).* Pp. 108-112. (in English).
12. Shils E. (1958) Tradition and Liberty: Antinomy and Interdependence. *Ethics. Vol. XLVIII, № 3.* Pp.

- 156-160. (in English).
13. Shtompka P. (1996) The sociology of social changes. *M.* 368 p. (in Russian).
  14. Trubitsyn D.V. (2010) Modernization of Russia and the East: the experience of philosophical interpretation. Novosibirsk. 364 p. (in Russian).
  15. Van der Loo P., Van Ryan V., Decree. Op.; Pain E. A. (2009) Multicultural modernization: evolution of theoretical views. *Social sciences and the present. No. 6.* Pp. 37-54. (in Russian).
  16. Vinogradov A.V. (2005) Chinese model of modernization. Search for a new identity. *M.* 333 p. (in Russian).
  17. Zapf W. (1998) Theory of modernization and differences in the ways of social development. *Sociological studies. № 8.* Pp. 35-48. (in Russian).