

Priority in interrelationship of political phenomena “transformation – modernization” in Central Eastern European post-communist countries

The paper examines inter relationship between political transformation and modernization. It has been proved that modernization does not exist without specific value qualities. In the majority of post-communist CEE countries after 1989 it has been necessary to perform tasks of political transformation and political modernization, which often could not be clearly differentiated. Thus, it is rather complicated to determine priority in correlation of such political phenomena as «transformation – modernization». However, having undergone necessary political transformation and modernization and become the EU members, a part of post-communist CEE countries are approaching, and other are striving for achieving that level of development, which they have chosen as a direction sign at the beginning of transformation and which has already been attained by Western countries.

Keywords: modernization, transformation, political modernization, CEE countries, political institutions, political structure.

ПРІОРИТЕТНІСТЬ У ВЗАЄМОЗВ'ЯЗКУ ПОЛІТИЧНИХ ФЕНОМЕНІВ «ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ – МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЯ» У ПОСТКОМУНІСТИЧНИХ КРАЇНАХ ЦСЄ

У статті досліджено взаємозв'язок політичних трансформації та модернізації. Доведено, що модернізації без певного ціннісного навантаження просто не існує. У більшості посткомуністичних країн ЦСЄ після 1989 року довелося водночас виконувати завдання політичної трансформації та політичної модернізації, які часто не піддавалися чіткій диференціації. Тому визначити пріоритетність у взаємозв'язку політичних феноменів «трансформація – модернізація» надто важко. Втім, здійснивши необхідну політичну трансформацію та модернізацію і ставши членами ЄС, частина посткомуністичних країн ЦСЄ наближається, а інші – прагнуть дійти до того рівня розвитку, який вони обрали як дороговказ на початку трансформації і якого вже досягли країни Заходу.

Ключові слова: модернізація, трансформація, політична модернізація, країни ЦСЄ, політичні інститути, політична структура.

Ability for modernization is a formula for successful development of the society, what has been testified both by history and modern practice. Analyzing changes in post-communist CEE countries and examining the essence of modernization processes, first of all it is necessary to discover if they are a part of transformation and what kind of correlation between them exist under democratization of the political system. Nowadays, this problem is extremely urgent. The first President of Bulgaria Zh. Zhelev, stated that “the key stage of post-communist democracy transformation is in the overall reformation of the political system, its approaching to the current political systems of the Western World, i.e. modernized societies”¹. We suppose that interrelation of transformation and modernization in CEE countries must be examined through political development, aimed at changing certain structural and functional institutions and elements of political system.

Basic categories of the modernization theory are represented by the notions “traditional society” and “modern society”. In many European languages notions “modern” and “present-day” are often used synonymously, though there are certain differences. In particular, “New Definition Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language” defines “present-day”, firstly, as that which belongs to the same epoch; secondly, as that which happens today, nowadays, currently; thirdly, as that which corresponds to the needs of time, caused by its requirements, modern, most recent². “Modern” is unambiguously defined as new-fashioned, actual, novel³. In the German language a word “modern” is used to oppose tradition. In the Polish language a synonym for the notion “present-day” are “aktualny” and “nowoczesny”. To our mind, a notion “modern” is more focused on the dynamics of development and is aimed at future, what is taken into consideration in our paper.

In accordance with this approach, changes in CEE countries after 1989 can be characterized as revolutionary-modernization. The term describes the essence of the processes, as the notions “modern”, “modernization” point at the social activity, aimed at changes, required by present time and which cover all spheres of the society’s activity: political, economic, social and ideological.

We tend to believe, that transformation (democratization) must be examined as an inseparable element of the society modernization under condition that it takes place in the spirit of

¹ Zhelev Zh. Novatavyschna politika na Bulgaria i NATO / Zh. Zhelev. – S., 1994. – P. 5.

² Novyi dumachnyi slovnyk Ukrainskoi movy. In 3 volumes / Ed. by V. Yaremenko and V. Slipushko. – Kyiv: Publishing house “Akonit”, 2006. – Vol. 1-3.

³ Bordachev T.V. Predely Evropeizatsii. Rossiia I Evropeiskii Soiuz 1991 – 2007: teoriia i praktika otnoshenii. – M.: GU-VSHE, 2008. – P. 22.

Europeanization⁴. In other cases there can be a variant of transformational changes towards authoritarianism, what is clearly testified by experience of Central Asian countries. Within instable societies, which are at the stage of modernization, conservatism is replaced by nationalism, which stands out as an independent ideological and political force. By all means, one cannot neglect that important role, which was played by nationalism in modernization processes in CEE countries. However, it is necessary to specify considerable difference in its tasks. For instance, in Ukraine and Baltic countries nationalists' efforts first of all were aimed at protecting independence, in Central-Eastern European countries – at restoring national values, and in Russia – at revival of a unified strong state and protection of the Russians' interests in separated countries. The idea of the "chosen" nation Russian scientists distinctly exploit in most modern conceptions of the Russian Federation development. Quite often they turn their attention to one of the famous representatives of radical nationalism M. Danilevskii, who justified pan-Slavism and an opposition of the Russian state ideology to the West⁵.

A problem of political modernization, faced by CEE countries and the USSR in 80s-90s of the 20th century, is described a bit separately. In response to social challenges, the scientists propose their own comprehension of the problem. I. Deviatko, studying activity theories, pointed out their close interconnection with modernization theories of practical rationality⁶. W. Zapf interpreted political modernization in a three-dimensional perspective: as a secular process, commenced by the industrial revolution, when a small group of countries, which are modernized nowadays, developed quite successfully; as a variable process, when low-performing countries tried to catch up with the leading ones; as attempts of modern countries to accept new calls on their way of innovations and reforms⁷. V. A. Zimin states, that political modernization can be defined as formation, development, and spread of modern political institutions, practices, as well as modern political structure. However, such institutions and practices must correspond to modern models of democratic institutions or surpass them. Therefore, they are intended to contribute to real participation of people in political power system and its influence on taking certain political decisions⁸.

On the contrary to a traditional modernization of social institutions, political modernization is formation, development, and spread of modern political institutions, practices, as well

⁴ Nowadays among the scientists, who study European integration a concept of Europeanization is becoming more and more popular, which, despite existing theoretical differences, concerning what in fact should be interpreted as Europeanization, its origins and influences on the political system and civil life and is applied mainly for comprehension and analysis of changes in any state's inner policy, caused by the process of European integration. Europeanization is determined as changes in all spheres of social life of the EU member states or the EU candidate states. Basing on this broad definition, the scientists propose a narrower definition of Europeanization as a process of formation, spread and institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, political paradigms, styles, courses of action, mutual convictions and norms, which are determined and approved at various EU decision-making processes and are incorporated into logic of inner discourses, certain traits, political structures, directions of state policy among the EU member states.

⁵ Danilevskii N. Ya. *Rossiiia i Evropa* / N. Ya. Danilevskii. – M.: Kniga, 1991. – 574 p.

⁶ Deviatko I.F. *Sotsiologicheskie teorii deiatelnosti i prakticheskoi ratsionalnosti* / I.F. Deviatko. – M.: Avanti Plus, 2003. – P. 225.

⁷ Zapf W. *Die Modernisierung und Modernisierungstheorien* / W. Zapf // *Modernisierung moderner Gesellschaften*. Hrsg. W. Zapf. – Frankfurt a M., 1991. – S. 24-25.

⁸ Zimin V.A. *Politicheskaia modernizatsiia v Rossii* / V.A. Zimin. – Samara: Publishing house of Samara scientific Center RAN, 2016. – P. 30.

as modern political structure. Political life of CEE countries required implementation of those, which would most adequately correspond to transformation of political system of the society and could adjust themselves to changes, modern challenges and would conform to the models of modern democratic institutions or differ from them in a way: from rejection of unfamiliar patterns to acceptance of the form, while filling it with an extrinsic essence. If we specify modernization as a transition from totalitarian regime to democracy, then its core lies in creation of social and political mechanisms, which let the biggest part of the society influence the decision-making processes. In this case, the theory of modernization reduplicates the theory of democratic transition, reducing fundamental principles of the theory of modernization to the principles of democracy consolidation.

Most often the mechanism of political modernization, namely “assimilation” (copying, imitation) of patterns is used. According to the world experience there are two types of imitation: imitation of an algorithm, when a mechanism of any process, its essence or functional loading is copied (as a process of cooperation between three branches of government); imitation of the result or form, the so-called “simulation” (declaration of free and competitive elections, i.e. de jure, taking into consideration their not free and uncompetitive nature de facto or formation of three branches of power without factual implementation of the principle of separation of powers).

Better results of modernization are obtained due to imitation of algorithms. It is carried out in a specific historical and social-cultural context of a country under influence of national traditions. Imitated institutions and practices are changing under impact of traditions, they adjust to them. One can observe inter-influence of traditions and borrowings, their alteration. The goal of modernization is creation of a differentiated political structure, territorial and functional enlargement of a central legislation, constant broadening and introduction of social groups, disabled people into political life, weakening of elites and their legitimacy and so on. Such goal of modernization is embodied in social values like economic growth of democracy, fairness, equality, welfare, stability, order. Main characteristics of social life, which must be eliminated in the course of modernization, are poverty dependence, inequality, repressions. Political institutions are created to solve constantly growing economic and social problems, which appear in the process of forming new, open type of cooperation, which presuppose: formation and development of rational bureaucracy, which would be responsible to political leaders, elected by people, as well as insure execution of necessary managerial functions on the basis of law; creation of political organizations, authoritative among population, which protect people’s right a possibility to be heard in significant political decision-making processes; existence of interest groups, which oppose each other, political unions and parties, free press; substitution of traditional elites by modernizers; enlargement of people with political and civil rights and so on.

Despite the fact that modernization may take place in different ways, M. V. Ilin singles out universal traits of political modernization: creation of differentiated political structure with

a high specialization of political roles and institutions; formation of modern sovereign state; strengthening of its role, broadening of the sphere of activity and intensification of the role of law as a linking element between a state and citizens; enlargement of number citizens (with political and civil rights) and active incorporation of social groups and disabled people into political life; formation and growth of rational political bureaucracy, alternation of a rational impersonified bureaucratic organization into a dominated system of management and control; weakening of traditional elites and their legitimacy; strengthening of modernizing elites⁹.

Transformation in CEE countries after 1989 gave a new impulse to the process of modernization. This directionality of the vector of social changes is inherent to all post-communist countries. Transition from authoritarianism to democracy was considered to be a victory of a western liberal model in the ideological opposition and overcoming system conflicts, at least large-scale ones. During the democracy's third wave, a name given by S. Huntington, this path has been chosen by almost 30 countries¹⁰. Therefore, the opportunity of establishing basic institutions described by structural functionalism has obtained its realization.

T. Parsons defines it as a development of evolutionary universals in the course of differentiation, increase in status, common values and incorporating into a single modernization process¹¹. Thus, a classical formula of modernization offered by R. Bendix has been testified, while he understands "modernization as a type of social changes, which is rooted in the English industrial and French political revolutions. It was found in economic and political progress of some societies-pioneers and subsequent changes among underperformers"¹². Elaborated by him theory of diffusion and movement "forward" explains stratification of societies in the international perspective, competitiveness in protection of advantages and liquidation of underdevelopment and long-standing attempts in ranging those who take the lead and those who go behind.

In political, economic and social perspective hopes among population in CEE countries in 1989-1990 testified, that the collapse of a team economy and party-government dictatorship unleashed universal innovation forces, earlier suppressed processes of institutions formation and gave power for further mobilization of powerful internal evolutionary forces. And they, in their turn, will force to rapid economic growth, political democracy and this justifies sacrifices of a painful but short period. However, the experience of political development, unfortunately, gives not so optimistic examples.

Revolutionism of social and political changes, which took place in CEE countries, did not cause doubts. Political and social-economic changes touched the grounds of the society, all its spheres and had profound and qualitative character. First of all they revealed in abruption

⁹ Ilin M.V. Slova i smysly. Opyt opisaniia kliuchevykh politicheskikh poniatii / M.V. Ilin. – M.:ROSSPEN, 1997. – Pp. 49-52.

¹⁰ Huntington S.P. Democracy's third wave / S.P. Huntington // Journal of Democracy, 1991 (Spring). – P. 18.

¹¹ Parsons T. Evolutionäre Universalien der Gesellschaft / T. Parsons // Zapf W. (Hrsg.) Theorien des sozialen Wandels. – Köln-Berlin, 1969. – S. 57.

¹² Bendix R. Modernisierung in internationaler Perspektive / R. Bendix // Theorien des sozialen Wandels. Hrsg. W. Zapf. – Köln-B., 1969. – S. 509.

of power inheritance, its full reconstruction. Such thesis can be controverted, as in Bulgaria, Hungary, the Czech Republic etc. political changes were grounded on laws and solutions were peaceful. However, terrific events took place in Romania in December 1989, as well as in Croatia in 1991. But prohibition of communist parties in most CEE countries or their almost immediate transformation into “socialistic” speaks for the abruptness of legal power inheritance, even if do not take into account less important. At the same time important decisions, which contradicted the then constitutions and legislations of those countries, ensured regime change.

The example is transformation of the Republic of Bulgaria; if we take into consideration the depth of modern political and social-economic changes by all means is revolutionary, and its modernization nature testifies of the vector of changes, of the aim set by the government and society. Modernization in the Republic of Bulgaria is a transitional process from a traditional towards a modernized society, including elimination of an old regime and formation of a new one, desocialization and resocialization of the society. Speaking of the value direction of a chosen vector of development, it can be interpreted as: positive-negative, success-decline of traditional norms, progress-regress etc¹³.

Polish scientist A. Walicki in his essay “Three Patriotism” carried out a profound analysis of Polish nationalism and pointed out its role in modernization processes. He studied patriotism as a faithfulness to the people’s will, which reveals in the desire for internal and external sovereignty; adherence to the national idea, which is traditionally preserved and will be implemented in future; and patriotism as a kind of protection of the real national interest, which should not correspond with the will of the majority of people, as well as (in this or that way) with a comprehensible national idea. A. Walicki approvingly speaks of Polish tradition to idealize Polish gentry’s democracy and similarity of the “Solidarity” to the old gentry’s civic movements and old-Polish forms of democracy. At the same, the scientist points out that the republican-democratic tradition existed in Poland without capitalism and individual-liberal values, which as many scholars believe, contributed to capitalistic modernization, while a democratic tradition amalgamated with a deeply rooted hostility towards “bourgeois” values and created psychological obstacles in the process of economic modernization. He highlights devotion of the Polish society to conventionalities, romantic heritage, and inclination towards celebration of defeats, what is clearly seen in modern Poland¹⁴.

These tendencies are indicative of the modernization processes in Ukraine. In the course of the post-Soviet development period of Ukraine in national political science predominated the idea concerning the necessity to implement decentralization practices in the state in order to achieve a higher, European level of state formation and democracy. National scientists usually state that transference of power competence and governmental resources to the local level will provide people with a broader opportunity to exercise the right to participate in

¹³ Cuellar J. *Nashe tvorcheskoe raznoobrazie* / J. Cuellar. – Sofia – Paris, UNESCO, 1996. – P. 37.

¹⁴ *Natsionalism: anthology*. – 2nd edition. / by: O. Protsenko, V. Lisovyi. – K.: Smoloskyp, 2006. – Pp. 566-599.

politics. However, a more profound examining of the problem shows, that this right is limited by a number of criteria, such as access to resources, which can be used as power resources, an ability to interpret adequately huge loads of diverse information as to the situation in the society, in order to take rational decisions and get an opportunity to resist influence of organized well-resourced groups, which have contrasting political interests. It should be mentioned, that such precautions as to inexpediency of accepting the process of power decentralization as a universal recipe of democratization long before found their conceptual framing in foreign social and political discourse¹⁵.

Modernization in political science is more often equated with positive processes – changes towards that type of economic, social and political system, which has already been formed in Western Europe and North America. Life cycle of modernization process has two stages. At the first stage it is identified as progressive, while the rest is routine, doomed to fail. The second stage of modernization process starts at the moment, when it becomes unwanted and inconsistencies of social changes just interfere. Such point of modernization cycle is called “social changes saturation point”. The criterion of the state-nation maturity and its elites is the existence and effectiveness of social technologies usage, which had to continue the already commenced modernization of the society. This situation caused challenges for national elites, the main of which was focused around the “saturation point”, including combination of destructive and constructive elements, as well as new and old points.

Usually to start the process of modernization one requires inner dynamics of social development and connections with external world¹⁶. That is why, modernization was two-fold: its models appeared in a society or were imposed/borrowed. These concepts are known in the political science as “internal” (inner) and “external” (outer)¹⁷. The second type of modernization is of two kinds: active and reactive attitude to its models. When we speak of active attitude we consider a two-step modernization: prime modernization models are created, which can be imposed or borrowed as secondary. In the Western world modernization took place “from above-within”, while in CEE countries – “from above-outside”. Selection of models and ways of modernization implementation depend on the role and maturity of elites in every specific post-communist country.

Crucial role in the process of modernization belongs to the social medium, where modernization models are implemented and adapted. Disregard of the social medium specificity stopped further modernization. The criterion for successful adaptation of a modernization model is a differentiated and socially rationalized society, which counterbalances social integrity. Along with that, it is necessary to prevent negative distortion of modernization models,

¹⁵ Kulishenko T. Yu. Detsentralizatsiia vladyy v Evropeiskyykh krainakh v konteksti vplyvu resursozabezpechenykh hrup / T. Yu. Kulishenko // *Hileia* : scientific newsletter : collection of research papers. – K. : M. P. Drahomanov NPU's publishing house, 2016. – Is. 108. – Pp. 297–299.

¹⁶ Myshkova D. Predimstvata na izostanalii / D. Myshkova // *Sotsiologicheskie problemy*. – 1995. – №2. – P. 37.

¹⁷ Dimitrov G. Bulgaria v orbite na modernizatsiata / G. Dimitrov. – Sofia, 1995. – P. 204.

distortion while they are “extracted” from the context of the prime social medium, in the course of “transformation” according to form and essence, their incorrect implementation in the society, which chooses the model. Introduction of models presupposes a certain level of communication of the society, modernization and communicative competence of the society in general.

Modernization by means of “introduced models” (imposed or borrowed) is “a process of conscious management of social changes, deliberate, willful, and, correspondingly, a certain type of social reality, constructed by power”¹⁸. Willful attempts presuppose a level of organization, maturity in decision-making processes and their implementation. Absence of directionality during modernization however does not mean its suspension – one should apply a theory of chance to current multi-choice social changes. Imposed modernization¹⁹ predetermines inner structuring of the process and requires constant changes. According to this approach, among its paradoxes one should take into consideration permanent dynamism and “change in a change”. Let us mention, that the research pointed out that in some CEE countries took place “accelerated modernization”²⁰.

Every society forms its own model of modernization, connected with a previous, pre-modernized basis, and therefore its development differs from the context of other societies. Reduplication, export of modernization is impossible. Studying industrialization and development Ch. Herper states that industrialization is a narrow notion, identical to economic development, while “development” itself is a narrower notion, which includes improvement of people’s material welfare.

In scientific literature modernization is divided into “successful” (stability of social succession) and “unsuccessful” (retraditionality). The intermediate variant is a “modernization crisis”, which appears, when various obstacles to constant succession of social innovations and retraditionality are deliberately created. Bulgarian scientist N. Genov points out at three types of states, which are undergoing modernization: dynamic; capable of constant adaptation; and those, which “fall” in modernization²¹. He also supposes that “political modernization” contributes to creation of a nation by means of a new consolidated ideology, introduction of its principles, increasing civil participation in management²².

Modernization is marked by certain tragicalness. Politicians must get into a new social role – politically managed modernization changes them from “structure-forming” into “structure-reflective” society. In such periods there is a need for maturity of political elites, which gives an opportunity to comprehend changes in status. During the process of modernization active

¹⁸ Khristov I. Miesto na pravoto v modernizatsionnite protsesy v Bulgaria / I. Khristov // Sotsiolohicheski problemy. – 1995. – № 2. – Pp. 123-124.

¹⁹ Myshkova D. Predimstvata na izostanaliia / D. Myshkova // Sotsiolohicheski problemy. – 1995. – №2. – P. 37.

²⁰ Dimitrov G. Bulgaria v orbite na modernizatsiata / G. Dimitrov. – Sofia, 1995. – P. 206.

²¹ Genov Kh. Ptisha na modernizatsiata / Kh. Genov // Politicheski izsledvaniia. – 1994. – №1. – P. 100.

²² Ibid. – P. 105.

interference of a state in economy and culture is limited by typical political and administrative tasks, refusal from the state regulation of economy and culture.

At the same time, we believe that the abovementioned types of modernization are not ideal. Most post-communist CEE countries are characterized by a combination of these types. Modernity keeps current questions of modernization in a new interpretation, in particular by the fact that modernization is a challenge for each society and every state undergoes modernization. Differences between societies are determined not along the "traditional – modernized" line, not along the kind, but by the degree, possibility or necessity of each state to participate in international communication.

Nowadays, among the factors of modernization one can name: globalization of technological transfer and market, international politics and conflicts, information, knowledge, culture. At the global level last three factors were recognized at the UN conference on information society and development in South Africa (1995), in UN Security Council's report on global development (1998), in the UNESCO world committee. At the level of the European Union these factors received recognition and initiative while creating "information society" and "society of perception", in the Program of preservation and enhancement of cultural differences. Successful modernization has a range of dependent criteria – transition to communication model, information society, people's security. Analyzing modernization one should pay attention to its cultural differences: in some cultures modernization is not interpreted as a central value; modernization is interpreted in different ways under culture of poverty and ethics of wealth²³.

Thus, modernization does not exist without specific value qualities. We suppose, that most CEE countries during the post-communist period simultaneously perform tasks of political transformation and political modernization, which often could not be clearly differentiated. That is why it is particularly complicated to determine priority in interrelationship of political phenomena "transformation – modernization" in post-communist CEE countries. However, it is important to state that performing necessary political transformation and modernization and becoming the EU members, a part of them are approaching, and other are striving for achieving that level of development, which they have chosen as a direction sign at the beginning of transformation and which has been attained by Western countries.

References

1. Bordachev T.V. *Predely Evropeizatsii. Rossiia i Evropeiskii Soiuz 1991 – 2007: teoriia I praktika otnoshenii.* – M.: GU-VSHE, 2008. – 258 p.
2. Genov Kh. *Ptisha na modernizatsiata / Kh. Genov // Politicheski izsledvaniia.* – 1994. – №1. – P. 98-104.
3. Danilevskii N. Ya. *Rossiia i Evropa / N. Ya. Danilevskii.* – M. : Kniga, 1991. – 574 p.

²³ Sotirova D. *Etikata na bohatstvo / D. Sotirova // Kapital.* – 1998. – 18-24 yuli. – P. 54; Sotirova D. *Kultura na bednosta / D. Sotirova // Kapital.* – 1998. – 4-10 yuli. – P. 55.

4. Deviatko I.F. Sotsiologicheskie teorii deiatelnosti i prakticheskoi ratsionalnosti / I.F. Deviatko. – M.: Avanti Plius, 2003.– 336 p.
5. Dimitrov G. Bulgaria v orbite na modernizatsiata / G. Dimitrov. – Sofia, 1995. – 272 p.
6. Zhelev Zh. Novatavysna politika na Bulgaria i NATO / Zh. Zhelev. – S., 1994. – 34 p.
7. Zimin V.A. Politicheskaia modernizatsiia v Rossii / V.A.Zimin. – Samara: Publishing house of Samara scientific Center RAN, 2016. – 155 p.
8. Ilin M.V. Slova i smysly. Opyt opisaniia kliuchevykh politicheskikh poniatii / M.V. Ilin. – M.:ROSSPEN, 1997. – Pp. 49-52.
9. Cuellar J. Nashe tvorcheskoe raznoobrazie / J. Cuellar. – Sofia – Paris, UNESCO, 1996. – 140 p.
10. Kulishenko T. Yu. Detsentralizatsiia vlady v Evropeiskykh krainakh v konteksti vplyvu resursozabezpechenykh hrup / T. Yu. Kulishenko // Hileia : scientific newsletter : collection of research papers. – K. : M. P. Drahomanov NPU's publishing house, 2016. – Is. 108. – Pp. 297–299.
11. Myshkova D. Predimstvata na izostanaliia / D. Myshkova // Sotsiologicheski problemy. – 1995. – №2. – P. 35-41.
12. Natsionalism: anthology. – 2nd edition. / by: O.Protsenko, V. Lisovyi. – K.: Smoloskyp, 2006. – 684 p. (“Politychni ideolohii”).
13. Novyi tlumachnyi slovnyk Ukrainskoi movy. In 3 volumes / Ed. by V. Yaremenko and V. Slipushko. – Kyiv: Publishing house “Akonit”, 2006. – Vol. 1-3.
14. Sotirova D. Etikata na bohatstvo / D. Sotirova // Kapital. – 1998. – 18-24 yuli. – P. 54.
15. Sotirova D. Kultura na bednosta / D. Sotirova // Kapital. – 1998. – 4-10 yuli. – P. 55.
16. Khristov I. Miasto na pravoto v modernizatsionnite protsesy v Bulgaria / I. Khristov // Sotsiologicheski problemy. – 1995. – № 2. – Pp.. 123-129.
17. Bendix R. Modernisierung in internationaler Perspektive / R. Bendix // Theorien des sozialen Wandels. Hrsg. W. Zapf. – Köln-B., 1969. – S. 505-512.
18. Huntington S.P. Democracy's third wave / S.P. Huntington // Journal of Democracy, 1991 (Spring). – P. 12-34.
19. Parsons T. Evolutionäre Universalien der Gesellschaft / T. Parsons // Zapf W. (Hrsg.) Theorien des sozialen Wandels. – Köln-Berlin, 1969. – S. 55-74.
20. Zapf W. Die Modernisierung und Modernisierungstheorien / W. Zapf // Modernisierung moderner Gesellschaften. Hrsg. W. Zapf. – Frankfurt a M., 1991. – S. 23-39.