



Published by the decision of the Scientific Council
of Khachatur Abovian
Armenian State Pedagogical University



Department of Philosophy and Logic
named after Academician Georg Brutian



W I S D O M

3(19), 2021



*WISDOM is covered in Clarivate Analytics' Emerging Sources
Citation Index service*

YEREVAN – 2021

UPDATING SOCIAL THEORY: REDEFINITION OF MODERNIZATION

Abstract

The article considered a critical appraisal of the modernization theory in its mono-paradigm frames and offers a heterodox conceptual meaning of modernization. Obviously, the varieties of methodological approaches to that important theoretical topic would have to be much more comprehensive than contemporary interpretations of linear pattern mainstream theories propose. Rethinking the conceptual foundations of the existing interpretation of the very concept is the model of adaptive modernization. Protecting its own matrix core, the system carries out partial correction of specific parameters, in which there is a lag, to increase their own vitality. Constructive changes are intra-systemic and occur within the existing order, without destroying its foundations, main institutional structures, and preserve the generic socio-cultural genotype Modernization, as reception of foreign cultural innovations (technical and technological) with their appropriate adaptation to the endogenous conditions, is an adequate adaptive response of a social system to external risks or exogenous origin impact.

Keywords: modernization, European Modernity, exogenous impact, complex system, innovation adoption.

Introduction

Modern civilization possesses significant opportunities and resources and, at the same time, gives rise to many problems that require urgent solutions. The interconnected and interdependent nature of the modern world acts today as a contradiction between the objective necessity and the subjective unwillingness of various states, peoples and regions to cooperate with each other due to existing civilizational, ethnic and ideological barriers. The actualization of constructive intercultural dialogue and equal cooperation turn researchers to the methodological arsenal of social theory, which is focused on the cognition of complex and dynamic social processes.

Modern social reality is multivariate, and the rate of its change is ahead of the rate of its study. The creative search for effective solutions to pressing problems generated by social and cultural dynamics helps to avoid the rigidity of

thoughts in social theory that can take shape in apologetics and dogmatism. And turning to the ontology and epistemology of social development in order to clarify the adequacy of the existing theoretical and cognitive approaches to the current social reality is not sporadic but an obligatory regular action. It is from this initial position that it is proposed to approach the problem of intercultural exchange, adoptions of innovations and the social changes that they entail, as well to test the compatibility of different approaches relevant to the research topic.

Although globalization is an objective trend in the newly established world order and reflects the collectivist human essence, it cannot be interpreted in the spirit of historical fatalism. This trend is influenced by both specific national characteristics, unique historical traditions, the different economic structures of certain countries, and the entire international economic and political situation. The new world order should

not be equated with one model coming from the West. The other versions of “multiple modernities” (Eisenstadt, 2000) can and should also take an active part in the formation of a new world order, and thus rid this order of its dangerous one-dimensionality. However, the problem is broader than the banal dichotomy of confrontation and interaction between any world geographic clusters, for example, “West-East”. To the fore in the global project of unification comes the concept of “modernization”, which has been established in social theory since the middle of the twentieth century and, in fact, determines the content of most reform processes in the countries of the modern world.

Modernization is not just a government-initiated reform technology or a specific program of actions required to achieve certain practical goals. Modernization is, first of all, a theory that systematizes methodological approaches to studying the patterns of development of transforming societies. This theory is so important and significant in social science that it served as a dividing line between modernist and post-modern styles of scientific thought. The principled position on modernization formed the basis of various paradigms. Addressing the topic of social change within the framework of social theory inevitably puts the researcher in the dilemma of choosing his own position in relation to modernization.

Since pluralism and methodological disagreements are immanent to the scientific community, the problems of local realizations of the content of theoretical concepts as forms of objectification of reality, the determination of conditions and factors contributing to the emergence of their various interpretations, the identification of mechanisms to counteract these processes, remain open for discussion.

Quite extensive criticism in the scientific literature since the 50s of last century by numerous researchers of the classical theory of modernization as a tool for cognizing social reality

is well known and focuses on the heuristic nature immanent problems of this theory (Lempert, 2019). The contrasting “traditional” and “modern” societies and the theoretical constructing of both categories as radially extreme oppositions into a rigid dichotomy does not seem entirely correct. Any innovation, interiorizing into other cultural systems, under the absence of rejection, adapts to the local specificities and builds into the life system of society and itself, consequently, becoming a tradition. Also, if modernization is a process identical to industrialization with concomitant changes of an economic, political and social nature, then in the scientific circulation there is the term “industrialization”. It seems illogical to duplicate it with the term “modernization” in the West-centric interpretation. Industrialization is indeed a modernization process for a previously non-industrialized country, but it is just one of the many modernizations that took place in the life of this particular society long before the onset of the Modern era in Europe. The accelerated transformations of societies based on technical and technological (economic, military, state-building, etc.) innovations of other cultures or done under external influence, risks and pressure have been observed throughout all world history.

Subsequent modifications of the theory within the framework of neo-modernism continue to rely on ideologically biased theoretical postulates that underlie the modernist paradigm. We adhere to the position that the concept of “modernization” definitely belongs to science but has an interpretation and content that is different from holistic disregard for the particular and uniqueness of the phenomenon of European Modernity. This article offers a heterodox approach to modernization theory that contrasts with the main schools of socio-theoretical thought and transcends the vast majority of the academic mainstream.

Methodology

The main sources of inspiration for such an alternative concept are the varieties of numerous forms of social life, a “multiplicity of modernity”, and awareness of the irreducibility of a diverse world to a single universal model of existence. The proposed theoretical slant in conceptual meaning is not in a methodological vacuum. The cultural sociology of J. Alexander has initiated an intensive process of integration into sociological theories not only of the impulses of cultures (including the traditions of scientific thought) of Asia, Africa, Latin America, but also a revision of the blissful picture of the world based on “modernity” (Alexander, 2003). Such an approach also correlates with both anthropological tradition (Boas, 1940) and a materialistic approach in culture research (Harris, 1979). Moreover, it associates with civilizational analysis patterns (Arnason, 2010) and operates within the framework of historical sociology (Subrt, 2017). The research is carried out using the principle of socio-historical determinism, which expresses the universal interconnection and interdependence of social phenomena, and the idea of the evolutionary nature of the social order of each society, correlating with the Path Dependence tradition with the incremental nature of social change and the relative institutional stability of societies. The methodology of linear patterns (structural-functional analysis in the interpretation of the homeostasis of the system, preserving its integrity) is combined with the civilizational approach (the existence of an institutional matrix, various value systems, variable cognitive-behavioural stereotypes in different societies, as well as an axiological determined choice of a certain social action). Specific factual historical material is used to verify hypotheses. The explanation of the mechanism of modernization (the process of introducing innovations) is carried out within the framework of the theory of complex systems (Rousseau, 2015) using the heuristic and descriptive capabilities of the discourse of syner-

getic theory (regarding system fluctuations, its behaviour at points of bifurcation and self-regulation). Since the positive and negative feedback is unique for each specific system, and the order parameters have not yet been determined unambiguously, the use of the concept of civilization matrices compensates for the limited possibilities of synergetic in explanation long-term periods of relative homeostasis. It clarifies the tendency of the system to certain attractors at bifurcation points. The logical and comparative-historical methods are also applied.

Results

The synergetic approach presents society’s cyclical and progressive development as a discrete process, with alternating evolutionary and bifurcation changes. The factors of self-regulation, self-organization, and preventing the catastrophic consequences of entropic fluctuations are stable social structures (trans historical institutional nuclei), which can be subject to discrete changes, but retain their own functionality for a long time. Value-rational ideas of public consciousness are fixed in the civilizational matrix of each particular society.

The socio-cultural component of a particular society, acting as a set of institutional constants, which finds expression in socio-cultural features that become dominant at the points of bifurcation, is the determining factor in the process of social changes (modernization is one of the varieties of such changes), initiating, catalyzing or refusing the very fact of such changes. The socio-cultural component sets the direction, specifics, and, consequently, the variability of social changes.

In the bifurcation period (under the influence of external causal influences), the future of a particular society appears as an unstable configuration of competing alternatives. The data of matrix culture, imprinted in the minds of people at the level of their genetic culture, are manifested as cultural specific features inherent only to this

society and which influence the vector of development of society, determining the ways of using borrowed fundamental discoveries, the level of dissemination of innovative inputs, acceptance or rejection of cultural innovations. The socio-cultural constituent constant of a particular society, being a system-forming component, strives to preserve homeostasis, a state of the relative stability of the system. While maintaining its own matrix core, the system carries out partial modernization, i.e. correction of certain parameters, in which there is a lag, to increase their own vitality. At the same time, constructive changes are intra-systemic and occur within the existing order without destroying its foundations, which carry institutional structures. Relatively stable constants preserve peoples and nations as integral social organisms that develop through gradual qualitative transformations but at the same time preserve the generic socio-cultural genotype. In this case, modernization acts as a reflection of the social system on exogenous impact as a means of maintaining a homeostatic, relatively stable state of the system.

Modernization is defined as the accelerated mobilization development of society, carried out through administrative action, through reception with appropriate adaptation to the endogenous conditions of foreign cultural innovations (technical and technological) of the novel nature, which is an adequate response of a particular social system to external risks or exogenous origin direct pressure. It is an adaptive property of the system eliminating negative tendencies of an externally causal nature, preserving the system itself as such, supporting its own evolutionary development, ensuring the relative homeostasis (state of controlled and controlled changes) of the system in order to avoid risky development scenarios with large amplitude of fluctuations. Modernization is one of the most socially painless ways to exit from crisis points, the most productive method of overcoming the state of bifurcation, adequate reply for changing external environment.

Discussion

1. Change in complex social systems

In the proposed meaning of the concept of modernization, it is the socio-historical phenomenon that is repeatedly recorded in the life of various societies throughout the history of humankind long before Western European societies reach certain stages of their own development. This phenomenon is irrelevant to the ontologically conditioned phenomenon of Western Modernity, as a special case in the history of heterogeneous planetary civilizations. It is constantly observed in the world-historical process without reference to the periodization of the evolutionary development of European societies with their epochs of Modernity, Postmodernity, Second Modernity, etc. The denial of the significance of European Modernity in world history and its subsequent influence on other civilizations through various forms of interaction, of course, is absurd. However, European Modernity is neither the starting point of the only possible reference model of social development nor the first pioneer of social transformation (Diamond, 2017). Moreover, before entering the Modern era, Western European societies in their own development actively adopted foreign cultural achievements and innovations and were transformed under the influence of other civilizations (Frank, 1998).

The study of social management practices within the framework of historical sociology, which implements the fundamental methodological position of sociology – comparability in the temporal dimension, proves the possibility of effective transformations of society to improve the functioning of the existing social system. Such transformations eliminate the risks of loss of national identity and the transmutation of the own population into ethnographic material for other cultures and make reformed society more viable and resistant against exogenous pressure. Such constructive changes are intra-systemic and occur within the existing social order

without destroying its basic institutional structures.

The theory of complexity, proposed for the analysis of dynamic and self-organizing systems (Urry, 2005), is reasonably correlated with this situation. The theory of complexity does not divide systems into open and closed, linear and nonlinear. It proceeds from the fact that each system is simultaneously open and closed and linear and nonlinear. Complexity theory rejects the dichotomy between stability and change. Agents of a complex system operate in a specific environment, demonstrating their ability to adapt to emerging circumstances.

The most significant contribution to the formation of an adequate picture of the modern world is the position of the theory of complexity, which resolves the dilemma of universality and uniqueness and explains the diversity of existing societies by the irreversibility of choice made at bifurcation points and the subsequent formation of a special pattern of action and development of the system. This thesis opens up wide research prospects focusing on the social actions in historical anthropology and macro-sociological studies of various societies (Pogosyan, 2018). Every action after implementation is irreversible and has corresponding consequences for shaping the future. It is possible to assume the consolidation, stereotyping of repeated typical action in the mass or individual-personal consciousness, or, at least, its definite impact on the sociocultural component of the activity subject, which allows identifying its specific characteristics, determine relatively general inherent properties (Collier, 2010), and relatively facilitate forecasting of possible future actions, especially in cases of external influence.

In the context of our research, the position of the theory of complexity in relation to the behaviour of the system at bifurcation points can be interpreted as the ability of the system to survive, the presence of a certain level of modernization potential in it. Being at the branching point under the influence of external environmental changes,

a specific social system, as a reaction to exogenous pressure, can, under certain conditions, realize the option of balancing the force acting on it by creating adequate counterforce by accepting innovation (absorption from the environment) which means the accelerated modernization that eliminates the risks of such exogenous impact.

External (exogenous) impact occurs during the “clash” or “dialogue” of civilizations: trade, population migration, wars, travel, the development of mass communications, etc., in the process of which innovations are spread, including their import into a certain society from the outside, which, in turn, serves as one of the most important mechanisms of social change. Social change is caused by innovations of the following types: new technologies (military, economic, managerial, scientific), cultural innovations (new beliefs, values, ideological constructions) and new forms of social structure. The content of such social interactions can be presented as a problem of innovations adaptations, the possibility of acceptance of innovations in local traditions, the volume of adoptions and the scale of their distribution in a particular society. It is the ability of societies to adopt technologies, practices, institutions, and cultural models that serve as a prerequisite for accelerating social progress and increasing their adaptive resources in adapting to new emerging social realities.

2. Modernization as a response to an exogenous challenge

Specific historical studies of examples of deliberate, obvious and systematic processes of copying and selective inclusion in local systems of institutional practices and ideas borrowed from abroad testify to the importance of influences, technology imports and institutional models in the national contexts of modernization processes.

The stability of a social system can be defined as the ability of the system to maintain and reproduce its integrity under external influences, internal failures, and over time and remain self-

identical when changing its forms. This presupposes, on the one hand, the ability to dampen fluctuating changes arising under the influence of minor factors, and on the other, to develop and consolidate constructive solutions to problems caused by the action of significant factors, without destroying its own structure and without denying its own principles of the device. For this aspect of sustainability, first of all, the social order is responsible since it is within its framework that the interaction of subjects that constitutes the system takes place.

The phenomenon of constant reorganization provides living systems with flexibility, increases their degree of freedom and expands the boundaries of social creativity. Innovations in complex systems provide for a certain disorganization, relaxation of the compulsory necessity accompanying the action of the principle of reorganization. Innovations, or, in other words, fundamental discoveries, are a new combination of known cultural elements or complexes, manifesting themselves in the form of material, conceptual, ideological or spiritual novelties.

According to the diffusion theory, any technological innovation occurs at a certain time and in a certain place, subsequently spreading in waves to other civilizations. The mechanism for the implementation of modernization, in our opinion, is as follows. A fundamental discovery made in a country of pioneering (primary) modernization allows to expand the ecological niche of its own ethnic group significantly, brings such a country to the level of a hegemonic leader. In the altered external environment, the rest of the actor countries face the question of not just competitiveness, but, first of all, the question of survival, the viability of the functioning system as such. This implies the need to change the parameter of the system in the shortest possible time, in which there is a lag in relation to the hegemonic country, or, in other words, the need for catch-up (secondary) modernization. The latter, in a similar context, can be defined as accelerated, catching-up development carried out through adminis-

trative regulation, aimed at the rapid achievement of strategic results, organic correction of parameters in which there is a lag, in order to ensure the stability of the social system in the face of the impact of exogenous factors.

European civilization, before becoming a standard of development for other societies, in the period of its own political formation, began precisely with transformations according to the Eastern model. The event that determined the fate of Europe for many centuries and shaped the appearance of the European Middle Ages was the reform of Frankish majordomo Charles Martel.

In 710 A.D., the Arab invasion reached the territory of Europe. In 725 A.D., in the battle of Arles, the Frankish infantry militia, armed with axes, was surrounded by Arab heavy cavalry and defeated. Having plundered the Rhone valley, the Arab army left. The military threat dictated the need for the Franks to create their own mounted troops hastily. The vassal warriors were given villages with peasants so that they could buy a horse and heavy weapons. This system of keeping mounted warriors was taken from the Arabs and was called "ikta" in the East and "beneficiaries" in the West. Due to the lack of free land due to previously distributed allods (hereditary landholdings), Karl Martell carried out a partial secularization of church lands, creating a land fund for the distribution of feuds. The beneficiary system allowed Karl Martell to create a powerful cavalry army. The cavalry, which required significant funds for service, became the core of the Frankish army. In 732 A.D., the new knightly army of Franks, in the battle of Poitiers, defeated the Arabs and forced them to retreat beyond the Pyrenees. The Arabs returned to Spain and stopped advancing north of the Pyrenees. The Franks thus protected Europe from Arab conquest. Moreover, having adopted the "ikta" feudal system and knightly cavalry, the Franks, having strengthened thanks to modernization, conquered all of continental Western Europe in campaigns of 725-734 A.D. (Fouracre,

2013).

Karl Martell's reform served as the basis for the formation and development of feudal relations in Europe. The modernization carried out by the Franks on the Arab model was of a mobilization nature (accelerated pace due to the impending military threat). The need for financial support for modernization reforms and the redistribution of land resources led to a conflict with the church, which, as a large landowner, was partially deprived of landholdings.

In this case, foreign cultural innovation reception was not just about adopting a new weapon, a method of use, technologies for its production and equipment. Essentially, this was a large-scale social modernization. The modernization of Frankish society, carried out by K. Martell, included a change in the economic system and the corresponding institutional transformations. However, this modernization was partial. It was not an utterly east-oriented model, that is, "easternization". Such kind modernization did not become a broad acceptance of Islamic values and the transformation of everyday life into an oriental way. During the reforms, no action was taken to change the Frankish identity. There was no goal either to change the socio-cultural foundations of Frankish society (religion, lifestyle, self-identification, etc.) nor to become a part of the Arab Caliphate. Such modernization had saved Frankish society as an independent civilizational unit from external threat, increased the efficiency of this social system, allowing, after passing through a destabilizing bifurcation state (due to the military pressure of the Arabs), to return to a state of relatively homeostatic stability in order to preserve its own evolutionary development while preserving its own civilizational matrix and social integrity.

3. Common and unique in transformation

Any considered social system is in communication with the outside world, which significantly affects the processes taking place in it. Complex systems must not only strive to survive, but

they also have to adapt to environmental changes and develop. They must obtain the ability to homeostasis (resilience) in order to maintain stability and exist. At the same time, any system as homeostatic can exist only under certain conditions that are within fairly narrow limits.

The following factors determine the stability of the social system in this sense:

- a) how adequate is the social order to the conditions for the existence of a social system – if it is not adequate, then the system will either disintegrate or change;
- b) how consistent are its components – if organizations, institutions and functions contradict each other at least in some part, the social system uses its resources ineffectively, which means it is weakened. If the coordination of matrices is significantly violated, the reproduction of the social system turns to be impossible;
- c) how much the social order is reflected and expressed in culture – this affects the awareness of social subjects of the purpose and meaning of order, and therefore, the desire to adhere to and reproduce it.

In general, the problem is reduced to the coordination of disparate components into an integral system, in which each element is adequate to all the others and to the system as a whole, which is a hierarchy of such elements. Such coordination necessarily requires conscious social activity and political will as a response to the pressing needs of modern moments in history. Thus, the interpretation of society as a social system is a homeostat that demonstrates the unity and struggle of the material and the ideal. Transformational processes in a particular society can be either unique due to history, mentality, cultural traditions or are inscribed in a complex of macro-processes occurring in the world, for example, associated with the establishment of a new technological order. Nevertheless, in both cases, transformational processes have a duality of objective and subjective.

The objective is conditioned in transforma-

tional processes by their concrete historical necessity and the “given” content. The motivating cause of social transformations is contradictions that are insoluble in the initial state of socio-economic relations, economic system, institutional structure, which block their stable functioning.

The subjectivity in transformational processes is associated with the actions of numerous subjects who are guided by various attitudes and interests. In this case, the dominant interests have a significant impact on the choice of forms and methods of change, as well as their scale.

Due to the versatility of the social system, its transformations are very diverse: they cover the productive forces and production relations, the needs and motivations of people, forms and methods of management, legal norms and ideological attitudes, the state-administrative structure and the political system. The transformations are ambiguous in their depth and scale. Intra-system transformations occur within the existing order without destroying its foundations, which carry institutional structures. Historical practice shows that effective transformations within a system can increase its resilience. “Mobilized” social transformations occur (as noted above) as a result of extreme social events: revolutions, wars, subjugation of local society and subsequent social synthesis, and as a result of cataclysms or worldwide processes of a global scale.

4. *Social order and limits of modernization*

The essential characteristic of a social system is stability, and this means not only general strength, balance, homeostasis but also the necessary accompanying reliability, survival, adaptability, the ability to self-preserve and self-development.

Stable systems have the following self-regulating properties:

1. instability: the system tests how it is best to adapt;
2. striving for balance: the entire internal, struc-

tural and functional organization of systems contributes to maintaining balance;

3. unpredictability: the resulting effect of a particular action can often differ from what was expected.

Any system is stable, being structurally constructed from the stabilizing more or less stable principle constants and changeable variable components. With all the relatively homogeneous technological equality of planetary countries, it is the socio-cultural constituent of a particular society that is unique. It also determines the specificity and dynamics of the transformation processes in society, being a kind of the base core of the system. According to N. Luhmann, the Autopoietic system composes itself, choosing (selecting) relations with the environment in the form of experience (Luhmann, 2012). At the same time, the border of the system with the environment is a fundamental property of any system that allows it to keep itself. The idea that the maintenance of the border is the essence of the maintenance of the system leads to the idea that there is a certain entropy corridor in which social systems can evolve. Such boundaries, on the one hand, ensure the system’s ability to innovate and, consequently, to adapt to changed conditions, and on the other hand, they allow maintaining the system integrity.

Modern scientific ideas about the world are associated with the concepts of polyvariance and diversity. The fatality and teleological finite predestination are denied, the objective existence of alternatives and the possibility of choice are recognized, but this choice is limited. Considering the social dynamics of the phenomena generated by the self-organizing component, the study of the structure as part of the system space, the elemental composition and the corresponding dynamic connections can help to understand the extent of such limitations.

Consequently, due to the difference in the forms of political activity, the diversity of socio-economic life and the multiculturalism of societies, there should be significant restrictions on the

use of the historical experience of other societies. Without highlighting the elements of incompatibility, the optimal and effective use of such experiences is impossible. The results of social history studies provide a basis for thinking about the limitations of the possibilities of social creativity and the unconditional taboo on such social actions that can realize the socio-catastrophic potential contained in them.

The polyvariety of development allows one to recognize the existence of qualitatively heterogeneous elements of society, which can be conditionally divided into external and internal (concerning the core of society, but not to society itself). The path of development of external elements (variable components of the civilization matrix) is characterized by the growth of contradictions that destabilize and undermine the stability of the system, as if preparing the ground for replacing it with another, assimilating the remnants of the former system. The permanent variety of external constituent elements of the system and a wide range of relatively contradictory individual and group interests and actions in society potentially include all forms of social communities, thanks to which society survives and adapts to different options for the future. A large number of diverse forms provide flexibility to the social system, its ability to respond quickly to challenges and adapt to changing conditions, which makes the social system resistant to a multivariate future (Pogosyan, 2019). The internal elements (relatively stable constants) preserve peoples and nations as integral social organisms that develop through gradual qualitative transformations while keeping the generic socio-cultural genotype. In these internal elements, self-organization processes are born, in which the system-forming, natural-spiritual principle prevails, which preserves and renews the substantive foundations of life.

5. Adaptive modernization model

The adaptive model of modernization is based on the evolutionist hypothesis of variability and

adaptation as the optimal way of survival and development of societies. Modernization allows the social system to adapt better, operate more efficiently, meet the more diverse needs of more people and at a higher level. The structure of a social system can facilitate or impede the diffusion of innovations (Rogers, 2003, p. 25).

Those societies, lagging, after comparing their own parameters with the characteristics of more developed societies or as a result of contact with more developed societies or cultures, are forced to modernize to not suffer defeat in the competition with those who have gone ahead. Reception of innovations does not necessarily lead to positive results; selective transplantation of cultural elements may not lead to the replacement of local institutions but may result in their deterioration, deformation of institutional architecture, and in some cases – lead to a wide variety of cultural and social anomalies. In addition, there may be cases of traditionalist nationalist reaction and rejection of innovations sometime after their introduction (Touraine, 1995). Moreover, as practice shows, received innovations are not always accompanied by the transfer of their systemic characteristics, i.e. places and roles in the donor culture system. The reasons for this lie in the nature of the social system as a social organism that is self-sufficient, self-regulating, self-developing and has a certain history of existence in the temporal dimension. (Heylighen, 2008).

The stability of the sociocultural component has become a reflection of the common historical tradition in solving the problem of civilizational interaction: the subordination of any innovation receptions, even cultural and spiritual, to the goals and objectives of national existence in history. In all historical phases of their interaction with the outside world, recipient cultures retained their distinctive character. During real modernization, there is no change in self-identification, and society's sociocultural foundations are not destroyed. The cases of the innovation-recipient country being under occupation or ex-

ternal control are not considered. The social synthesis also takes place in these cases, but this process can be identified as a colonial expansion of the innovation-donor country rather than modernization.

In explanation the resulting processes of innovative reception and the formation of a new social context, it seems productive to use the conception of adaptive modernization, which is based on the idea of mutual influence and interdependent transformation of imported innovations and endogenous traditions.

The decentralization of European discourse in the modernization paradigm resulted from a profound revision of the theory in the last quarter of the twentieth century. The concept that exogenous modernization could take place in non-convergence with European civilization was raised. S. Eisenstadt offered the idea of a plurality of modernities due to the impact of multiple cultural programs and pointed out the positive significance of tradition - it provides socio-cultural stability to modern society and allows it to maintain a positive identity.

The statement of the fact that it was impossible for non-Western societies to completely copy the Western model led to the emergence of the concept of partial modernization (Rueschemeyer, 1976). The symbiosis of innovative exogenous elements introduced into the traditional context, which lost their ability to function as rational, and endogenous non-modernized elements, the traditional functioning of which was also blocked, was considered by D. Rueschemeyer as unproductive. A situationally oriented partial model can be considered as a particular, suboptimal case of a linear modernization model. This model is Eurocentric and one-dimensional, based on a clear theoretical understanding of the result of modernization, which does not preserve elements of traditional structures. However, Rueschemeyer's idea of the partial nature of modernization transformations is very relevant to the problem we have posed. According to our assumptions, adaptive modernization has a partial na-

ture. It transforms a parameter of the system that needs to be tuned in order to adapt and respond to external environmental risks, but it does not become overarching due to the sociocultural component of the civilization matrix. Such a model of adaptive modernization in the meaning we suggest creates a research space in which not only innovative fragments of reality but also traditional ones have the right to exist. The latter, within the framework of this approach, appear not only as passive recipients doomed to destruction but also as autonomous active formations capable of adapting to new conditions and developing their own survival strategies. That is why modernization transforms societies in reality only partially and each time creates a unique symbiotic combination of institutions, regarded by S. Eisenstadt as numerous manifestations of modernity. Socio-cultural constants of a particular society are a condition for the relative stability of society. Social modernization, in this case, acts as an adaptive reaction of the social system on exogenous challenges.

It is imperative to comprehend the experience of synthesis of local and transplanted institutions. In transition countries, along with the necessary changes, an attempt was made to dismantle all local institutions in the process of modernization completely, but some of those remain the foundation on which these societies continue to exist, preserving elements of the usual order in the chaos, during the reorganization of institutional architecture.

Conclusion

In the process of human cultural development, the importance of ideas and innovations that transcend national boundaries cannot be ignored. The nature of the interaction of different societies determines the vectors of development under exogenous pressure and makes it possible to explain some aspects of the historical process, but, of course, not all. In addition to external influences, their interaction with internal character-

istics and following synthesis, there is an immanent logic of processes due to the action of endogenous factors. The end result of social modernization, the very results of innovation copying, largely depend on the historical context to which society must adapt. The general course of development will be successful only if it is possible to harmonize endogenous and exogenous influence factors (Diamond, 2005). Thus, no society can stay away from the action of exogenous factors, but the ideas, institutions and technologies obtained must be adapted to the local society in order to avoid destructive tendencies, to maintain the stability of a particular social system and to keep the existence of its own cultural genotype (Richerson & Boyd, 2005).

In comparison with other models, the proposed theoretical model of adaptive modernization makes it possible to more adequately describe the complex relationship between tradition and innovation, which are accompanied by mutual influences, transformations, and the construction of symbiotic institutional constructs. This rethinking of the concept of modernization solves the dilemma of “Western centrism - Eastern centrism” for transitional countries in the non-European area. In general, excess competition between different cultures for their own “contribution” to world development is unreasonable and senseless since humanity is one on a historical scale of time. Such a model with its more comprehensive interpretation of modernization can be used as a methodological tool to study the multiple procedures for adopting innovations in social history with unique results in each case and expands the research perspectives of social theory. While realizing the importance and influence of the era of European Modernity for the history of humankind, this interpretation of the concept of modernization, nevertheless, allows switching the attention of researchers from the problems of the genesis of capitalism to other processes of social development and cross-cultural interaction.

References

- Alexander, J. C. (2003). *The meanings of social life. A cultural sociology*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arnason, J. (2010). The cultural turn and the civilizational approach. *European Journal of Social Theory* 13(1), 67-82. doi: 10.1177/1368431009355866
- Boas, F. (1940). *Race, language, and culture*. New York: The Macmillan Co.
- Collier, J. (2010). A dynamical approach to identity and diversity in complex systems. In P. Cilliers & R. Preiser (Eds), *Complexity, difference and identity. issues in business ethics* (Vol. 26, pp. 79-93). Dordrecht: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-90-481-9187-1_5
- Diamond, J. (2005). *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Viking.
- Diamond, J. (2017). *Guns, germs, and steel: The fates of human societies*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Eisenstadt, S. (2000). Multiple modernities. *Daedalus*, 129(1), 1-30.
- Fouracre, P. (2013). *Frankish history: Studies in the construction of power*. Variorum collected studies series. Farnham, Burlington: Ashgate.
- Frank, A. G. (1998). *ReOrient: Global economy in the Asian Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Harris, M. (1979). *Cultural materialism: The struggle for a science of culture*. New York: Random House.
- Heylighen, F. (2008). Complexity and self-organization. In M. J. Bates & M. N. Maack (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of library and information sciences* (Vol. 2., pp. 1215-1224). Oxford: Taylor and Francis.
- Lempert, D. (2019). Is modernization really unique in the history of human development (Or just another approach that

- will self-destruct)? *Journal of Globalization Studies*, 10(1), 27-43. doi: 10.30-884/jogs/2019.01.03
- Luhmann, N. (2012). *Theory of society*. (Vol. 1). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Pogosyan, V. (2018). Philosophies of social behavior research: Meta-analytic review. *Wisdom*, 11(2), 85-92. <https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v11i2.212>
- Pogosyan, V. (2019). Change and variability of phenomena in complex social systems. *Wisdom*, 13(2), 95-103. <https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v13i2.276>
- Richerson, P. J., & Boyd, R. (2005). *Not by Genes Alone: How culture transformed human evolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Rousseau, D. (2015). General systems theory: Its present and potential. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*. 32(5), 522-533. Special Issue: ISSS Yearbook: Learning across Boundaries <https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2354>
- Rueschemeyer, D. (1976). Partial modernization. In J. J. Loubser, R. C. Baum, A. Effrat, & V. Lidz (Eds.), *Explorations in general theory in social science: Essays in honor of Talcott Parsons* (Vol. 2., pp. 756-772). New York: Fress Press.
- Subrt, J. (2017). *The perspective of historical sociology: The individual as homo-sociologicus through society and history*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Touraine, A. (1995). *Critique of modernity*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Urry, J. (2005). The complexities of the global. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 22(5), 235-254.