

UDC 323.1

**THE PROBLEMS OF IDENTITY TRANSFORMATION IN THE  
PROCESS OF POLITICAL MODERNIZATION**

**MARIAM MARGARYAN, LUSINE NIKOGHOSYAN**

*Public Administration Academy of the Republic of Armenia*

The article substantiates the theory of political modernization as a general model for managing global and glocal political processes. Proceeding from the logic of S. Huntington's "the third wave" of democratization, the authors of the article have systematically observed the mechanical dichotomy of "traditional-modern" values, the vectorial nature (only liberalization) and the "westernization" of the process of building a "modern society", which led to ontological transformations. According to the authors, the crises of political development caused by the latter can only be overcome by a civilized dimension of political modernization. Political modernization is defined as a development process, the institutional changes of which are viable if they consolidate political institutions and build citizens' political consciousness. At the same time, there is a justified opinion that with the help of new information and communication technologies, the "soft power" as a player in the management of ethnic policy, develops texts and agendas of political development full of inaccuracies, creates various scenarios of tolerance. According to the authors, tolerance, as an instrument of "soft power" should not be perceived as a concession and ensuring the formal viability of political power by the mechanical rejection of ethno-national identity. It is proposed to carry out political management **using a scientific and analytical paradigm, which allows us to consider the convergence of national, political and civic identities in the three-dimensionality of past-present-future as a condition for normal modernization of the society.**

**Keywords:** political modernization, democratic transition, civilizational dimension, national identity, ethnic identity, soft power, smart power, tolerance, political-civil identity, scientific-analytical paradigm.

**The Evolution of the Value System of Political Modernization**

Due to intentional or situational changes, the process of political modernization ensures the qualitative development of democratic institutions of the political system. As part of the wave of democratization [1, p. 68-75], all the states were modernized, with the difference that the qualitative nature and results of the changes taking place were very different for their political system [2, p. 94-95]. It should be noted that is with these considerations that the process of political modernization has socio-ethno cultural value orientations. Taking as a starting point the principles developed by K. Marx,

M. Weber, A. Tokfili, V. Pareto and T. Parsons, the theorists of political development and modernization in 1950 conventionally divided societies into **traditional and modern ones**. The ideologist of modernization Sh. Eisenstaedt considered the transition to a modern society a linear process of change, which by its revolutionary nature was established in the 17-19 centuries in Western Europe, North America and spread to South America, Asia and Africa in the 19-20 centuries [3, p. 13-14]. It was the integrity of these complex changes that prompted a revision of the “modernization” concept, valuing the dichotomy of the **traditional and modern** embodiment of varied changes in the development that have taken place in newly independent countries since 1950. Already in 1950, due to the collapse of the European colonial empires, the independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America were offered a strictly linear program of liberal-democratic transition from liberalism to modernity, where the United States and Western Europe were presented as countries that were constantly innovating on the characteristics of modernity [6, p. 112].

Overall, presenting modernization as a special value-oriented direction of institutional development, the theorists of that time (J. Almond, D. Powell, L. Pai, S. Huntington, etc.) were convinced that the result is registered in this process due to the development of capitalism, national economy and technology in the society. The process of decolonization started with this theoretical generalization, according to which nations could self-liberate independently, and in the context of independence, self-modernize and self-realize based on the western example. As a result, the mechanical “westernization” became the main feature of the first stage of the modernization theory [4, p. 202-203]. The operation of such modernization in African-Latin American countries has shown that in reality the clash of traditional social structures and mentality leads to the corruption of power relations, arbitrariness of bureaucracy, increased poverty of the population and consequently leads to alienation and marginalization. Based on the obtained results, the theorists of political modernization in 1970-80 concluded that the processes of modernization are conditioned by ethnic and social-cultural factors (anthropological type, national identity, the degree of acceptance of universal norms, the goal of political development). In fact, the modernization could be carried out only under conditions of the natural modernization of the political essence of the value system of the national identity of the social strata and in the conditions of continuous development of political, civil identity.

Meanwhile, the changes made for the mentioned goals as a vector, by constantly monitoring the ascending and irreversible liberal process, have pushed out the civilizational aspect and the issue of the social price of modernization [8, page ]. Back in the mid of 1970, the shortcomings of the modernization vector model were revealed. As a result, the principles of modernization were severely criticized, especially in the context of **tradition-modernity** dualism [8, page 7]. In this context, S. Huntington having an institutional approach as a starting point developed a concept according to

which the modernization on one hand was determined **by the degree of participation of civil competition** and by the degree of **institutionalization** and the purpose of participation on the other hand [2, p. 29]. Indeed, as the Latin American-African experience of political development shows, the military coups were preceded by a long struggle to establish political stability by restoring the constitutional order, as the countries were immersed in the crises of political development (distribution, mobility, participation, identity, legitimacy).

However, given the overthrow of the dictator A. Salazar (1889-1970) regime during the Carnation Revolution in Portugal and the beginning of the “third wave” of democratization by S.Huntington the policy of change strategy aimed at building a “modern society” in Latin America and Africa in 1970s and 1980s has been criticized and amended.

First, the appropriateness of changing the vector (liberalization) was put under question, then the format of “westernization”, since the combination of traditional and modern institutions in countries with different civilizational dimensions (Turkey, Egypt, India) leads to different results. Based on all this, **the political modernization was defined as a development process capable of introducing institutional innovations, by mobilizing the national resources and by socializing the citizens. As such**, it seeks to achieve national unity, agreement (of pact) and consolidation by overcoming social and ethnic differences, establishing new rules of the game, and creating **new institutions** responsible for the modernization of the political system. With these considerations, a civilized approach to modernization was adopted, emphasizing its paramount importance in the development of ethno-national phenomena, as it radically changes the operating conditions of a nation or ethnic group.

### **“Soft power” as a Player in the Management of Ethnic Politics**

Guided by the principle that democracy is a vector liberal process in the course of political modernization, the post-Soviet political elites institutionalized the state power without taking into account the problems of the African-Latin American democratic transition. This led to the emergence of political development crises (identity, distribution, participation, legitimacy) and poor quality democracy in those countries. In this respect, L.Diamond made a remarkable observation: “the democracy in post-communist countries is a superficial phenomenon with bad governance ... The elections become a competition between corrupted and clientele parties. There are parliaments and local self-government bodies that do not represent an agenda of public interest. There are constitutions that do not provide constitutionality “. In fact, in the process of political modernization, the ethnic politics with the value of elite public relations, as well as conditioned by the application of principles of liberal-nationalist ideology, became the basis for the use of hard or soft power. The experience of political modernization of African, Latin American and post-Soviet countries proves that ethnic policy is of paramount importance, especially from the point of view of

democratization of the state institution and development of an international image.

In order to understand the nature and essence of the strategy of the state's national policy, first it is necessary to study what ideological principles it is based on. Gathering the problems of implementing **various** (soft, hard) **strategies** used in the process of political modernization in Africa, Latin America and post-Soviet countries, today it is necessary to accept that to smooth out the differences between tolerance, coexistence and soft assimilation, game mechanisms of **hybrid implementation of ideologies** were put at the core of this. Summarizing the existing experience, it should be admitted that despite **various** ethno-political **strategies** and **hybridization of ideologies**, the use of its pure (soft, hard) forms in this process is obvious. In this context, especially with the development of new information and communication technologies, the choice of communication content used by soft or hard power plays a key role, due to the tendency to create a consolidated communicative space of interethnic relations. The modernization policymakers continue to work diligently to destroy or undermine the integrity of ethnic space. At the first glance, the space seems to have lost its role of defending the sovereignty. It is obvious that the communication transmitted by the representatives of the "soft power" in different parts of the world crosses the border of any country, as modernity flows as a fast-flowing river (flooded river) destroying all border checkpoints [8]. Liquid modernity is a metaphor for postmodernity. That is, if the society in the times of modern was gradually changing its former "stable" format, then modernity, by its turbulent nature provides many opportunities for change, assuming a personalized perception of reality. Accepting as a starting point the fact that the changes are aimed at allegorical perceptions of reality, Z. Baumann, justified the need to quickly transform the reality through an individual by the development of flexible communication. In fact, Z. Baumann tries to generalize the humanity by individualizing the society [9]. With a view of implementing that approach, new information and communication technologies and various scenarios of political turbulence began to be used actively. Moreover, along with the growth of ethnic diversity, competition and interethnic subcultures at global and glocal levels, any state faces the dangers and challenges threatening its identity. Naturally, in this process the interests of ethnic majorities and minorities, natives (autochthonous) and newcomer ethnic groups can be manipulated by "soft power" for the sake of power, resources and self-affirmation. In that case, the political authorities of developing countries still cannot use the game logic of globalization opportunities to respond to challenges through the development of interethnic communication. Meanwhile, the trends in the development of national, political and civil identity, ethnic coexistence are determined by the intensity of their domination. Within the context of postmodernity it is important to distinguish between the following types of interethnic relations - **the first is constructive and symmetric**, which implies that the ethnos "They" (unknown, alien) and its typical culture is

perceptible, understandable and acceptable. **The second type**, which is destructive and asymmetric, where the ethnos “They” (unknown, alien) is not perceptible, understandable and acceptable. Given that ethnos is never static and as a living organism, it is in a movement assuming dynamic equilibrium, it can be stated that it is conditioned by an impulse being outside that system; it has its own degree of stability. The latter is not determined by the size of the population; it is determined by the qualitative characteristics of communication links. This makes the ethnos stable, that is, capable of transforming and creating external and internal communication links in accordance with the challenges. In fact, ethnos as a living organism is coordinated by traditions formed through the period of time, by geographical and anthropological features. It is based on the latter that ethnos due to the members, which transmit various communicative connections, accept and divide the world into **ours - “We” and strangers- “They”**. Due to the content of communications, ethnos develops mechanisms of confrontation and cooperation with others.

Based on the values of “We” and “They” the nature of interethnic communications becomes dominant in the consciousness of ethnic groups in the three-dimensionality of past-present-future. The process of this ethnic communication proves that current postmodern world is a world of interethnic communications, migration and unfinished ethno genesis. “We” and “They” opposition becomes a tool of ethnic mobilization in the context of a certain value of interethnic communication, the ideological basis of which is a hybrid ideology dominated by the national identity and values. Primordialists in politics proceed from the conclusion that every nation, anthropologically and culturally homogeneous, has its own cradle, its historically owned land, on the territory of which it must self-determine creating a mono-ethnic state. This provision coordinates the following main value components of ethno-national vitality - **territorial, linguistic, religious and self-determination**.

This summarizes the indisputable assertion in ethno-politics that there is an inseparable uniting connection between the land and the ethnos. This approach sums up the statement about the need for compatibility of **territorial and political borders** with the ethnic ones. Certain ethnic territories with their **cultural-linguistic** and other peculiarities are declared vital for a certain ethno-national unit. The political problems caused by language differences are one of the most difficult ones. It was W. Altermatt’s valid point that ethnic cleansing first occurs in the brain, that is, at the level of symbols and language [10]. That is why the state implements a special language policy, develops special laws on language. At the same time, the behavior of authorities and other political actors is developed based on ethno politics, which is realized through “hard” or “soft” forces. It is obvious, that in postmodern period the “soft power”, which is responsible for the principles of tolerance and citizenship, has become an alternative to the force of ethno-nationalism. In this sense, the principles of tolerance were actively disseminated on November 16, 1995, in Declaration 5.61 of the General Conference of UNESCO. Within the framework of this document, the role of

both - the state and the civil society was highlighted in perceiving the cultural diversity, forms of self-realization, expression of a person's individuality and public coexistence. However, the principle of tolerance /as well as the freedom associated with it/ is not a policy against identity, but the means of generating respect towards coexistence and the existence of another. However, this should not become a source of manipulation, just as after the 1994 Bishkek ceasefire between Karabakh, Armenia and Azerbaijan the OSCE Minsk Group ignored the security of the Republic of Artsakh /as an unrecognized state/ as a result of its policy of equality and neutrality. This was evident during the April 2016 aggression, and especially during the 44-day war of 2020, and the tragic consequences that followed. In our opinion, by displaying and promoting such tolerance, the authorities first expected to discover in this way the possibilities of changing the identity of the conflicting parties in game logic and then reduce the growing conflicting values of postmodernism to a glocal level by manipulating the conflicting social and civilizational dividing lines. In this context, the conflict with constantly changing social values due to the expansion of social differentiation, the increase in the diversity of subcultures and the intensification of communication between cultures deepens even more, which leads to an identity crisis. For this reason as well, the document in the context of "unrecognized states" and "color revolutions" in post-Soviet space has been and is still criticized. The main challenges of the 21st century are not to view the soft power as a player in normal modernization, but to make the identity crisis playful. Saying the identity here, we mean the individual's acceptance of ethnic, national, political, civic values as a condition for self-realization of his "Self". Soft power based on stereotypes in society uses tools to create a positive (as well as negative) image of ethnic cultures. Thus, tolerance implies not only acceptance of cultural diversity, respect for self-expression, but also ensuring security, which allows us to replace the culture of war with a culture of cooperation. Tolerance as a soft power tool should not be seen as a concession to ensure the viability of political power through mechanical denial of identity. However, summing up the activities of the "soft power" in the newly independent post-Soviet countries, it can be stated that tolerance is deliberately exploited, presenting it as a means of eliminating or neutralizing the aggressive expressions of identity in multiethnic society or in glocal spaces. This circumstance allowed the "soft power" to misinterpret the tolerance by becoming a participant in "color revolutions". Meanwhile, the experience of democratic transition shows that ethno-political strategy developed on the basis of tolerance, which will be aimed at resolving the ethnic conflicts, may differ in its tactical results. **First** is the ethno-political demarcation that is applicable in case when there is no conflict based on the historical memory in interethnic relations. This is a realistic tactic, if there is an environment of relatively ethnic tolerance and the existing problems are resolved within the framework of constitutional norms. **The second** option is that public perceptions are virtualized and illusory that tolerance will solve all problems. Such a policy leads to the situation when the authorities do not

control the violation of the rights of national minorities, do not solve the problems of natives. In these conditions the tension arises, which either escalates into an armed conflict, or it is manipulated or archived. **The third option** - the development of civic identity requires the creation of a culture of cooperation. Since the multiple communication technologies (Facebook, Viber, Instagram, Twitter, LinkedIn, etc.) on one hand and the format of civic modern participation (through Facebook, YouTube comments, online publications, video blogs) on the other hand caused the need to dispute the effectiveness of existing communication mechanisms, are the politicians able to provide the “public space” where the person becomes a citizen and is able to form a political offer and demand. In “information-knowledge-artificial intelligence” society, the “soft power” can no longer be viewed in the context of purely international relations. According to J. Nye, the “soft power” should be viewed as an integral part of the leaders and the ruling elite of the state, being a “smart power” that ensures the internal political stability pursuing the aim of modernization of the state identity in the system of modern international relations [12]. From this point of view, Nye distinguishes the following skills that determine the effectiveness of the “soft power” - 1) emotional balance, 2) foresight and 3) feedback-based communication [13]. Given the need for convergence of the above three skills, it should be noted that it is only through them that the elites in the political era, realizing the imperatives of natural normalization, develop institutional sub-systems of national, political and civic identity. **Considering these factors, it is necessary to exercise political governance through a scientific and analytical paradigm, which allows the natural modernization in the three-dimensionality of past-present-future.**

## REFERENCES

1. **Samuel P. Huntington.** *The Third Wave. Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, University of Oklahoma Press, 1991, p. 366
2. **Samuel P. Huntington.** *Political order in changing societies*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1968, p. 448
3. **Эйзенштадт Ш.** Революция и преобразование обществ. Сравнительное изучение цивилизаций / Пер. с англ. А. В. Гордона под ред. Б. С. Ерасова. — М., Аспект Пресс, 1999.
4. **Иноземцев В.** Демократия и модернизация: к дискуссии о вызовах XXI века/ Центр исследований постиндустриального общества. -М.: Изд. «Европа», 2010.
5. Модернизация и политика в XXI веке/ отв. ред. **Ю. С. Оганисян**; Ин-т социологии РАН.- М.: (РОССПЭН), 2011.
6. **Մարգարյան Մ.,** Քաղաքական արդիականացման հրամայականները Հայաստանի Հանրապետությունում, Եր.: «Քաղաքացիական ծառայություն», 2019, էջ 310:
7. **Diamond L.** Breaking Out of the Democratic Slump. *Journal of Democracy*. Volume 31. 2020, pp. 44-45.
8. **Bauman Z.** *Liquid Modernity*, 2000, p. 240.
9. **Bauman Z.** *The Individualized Society*, 2000, p. 272.
10. **Альтерматт У.** Этнонационализм в Европе / Пер. с нем. М.: Российский гос. гуманитар. ун-т, 2000. С. 161.
11. **Harary Y. N.,** *21 Lessons for the 21st Century*, Spiegel And Grau, Jonathan Cape, 2018, p. 372.
12. **Nye Jr. J. S.,** *Hard, Soft, and Smart Power // The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* (Ed. by **A. F. Cooper, J. Heine, and R. Thakur**). Oxford University Press, 2013, էջ 559-576:
13. **Joseph Nye** on Smart Power // Harvard Kennedy School Insight Interview (July 3, 2008). <https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/joseph-nye-smart-power> (Accessed 12.03.2021).
14. **Deutsch K.** *Political community and the North Atlantic area. International organization in the light of historical experience.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
15. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000094612?posInSet=3&queryId=aab9fc3e-5c47-492b-bcb6-0094e51cff60>



**ԻՆՔՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԿԵՐՊԱՓՈԽՄԱՆ ՀԻՄՆԱԽՆԴԻՐՆԵՐԸ  
ՔԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆ ԱՐԴԻԱԿԱՆԱՑՄԱՆ ԳՈՐԾԸՆԹԱՑՈՒՄ**

**ՄԱՐԻԱՄ ՄԱՐԳԱՐՅԱՆ, ԼՈՒՍԻՆԵ ՆԻԿՈՂՈՍՅԱՆ**

*Հայաստանի Հանրապետության պետական կառավարման ակադեմիա*

Հոդվածում քաղաքական արդիականացման տեսությունը հիմնավորված է որպես գլոբալ և գլոկալ քաղաքական գործընթացների կառավարման ընդհանուր ձևաչափ: Ելակետ ընդունելով Ս. Հանթինգթոնի ժողովրդավարացման «երրորդ ալիքի» տրամաբանությունը՝ հոդվածի հեղինակները համակարգված դիտարկել են «ավանդական-արդիական» արժեքների մեխանիկական դիֆուզիան, «ժամանակակից հասարակություն» կառուցելու գործընթացի վեկտորայնությունը (միայն ազատականացում) և «արևմտականացումը (westernization)», որոնք հանգեցրել են գոյաբանական այլակերպումների: Վերջիններով պայմանավորված՝ քաղաքական զարգացման ճգնաժամերը, ըստ հեղինակների, կարելի է հաղթահարել միայն քաղաքական արդիականացման քաղաքակրթական չափմամբ: Սահմանված է **քաղաքական արդիականացումը որպես զարգացման գործընթաց, որի իրականացրած ինստիտուցիոնալ փոփոխությունները կենսունակ են, եթե մոբիլիզացնելով ռեսուրսները համախմբում և հարատև սոցիալականացնում են քաղաքացիներին:** Միևնույն ժամանակ հիմնավորված է կարծիք, որ **օգտագործելով տեղեկատվահաղորդակցական նոր տեխնոլոգիաները «փափուկ ուժը» որպես էթնիկական քաղաքականության կառավարման դերակատար** մշակվում է անորուշություններով հագեցած քաղաքական զարգացման տեքստեր և օրակարգեր, ստեղծվում է տոլերանտության տարբեր սցենարներ: Հեղինակների կարծիքով, որպես «փափուկ ուժի» գործիք տոլերանտությունը չի կարելի ընկալել որպես զիջում և էթնոազգային ինքնության մեխանիկական մերժման գնով քաղաքական իշխանության ձևական կենսունակության ապահովում: Առաջարկվում է քաղաքական կառավարում իրականացնել **գիտավերլուծական հարացույցի (պարադիգմայի) օգնությամբ որը հնարավորություն է տալիս անցյալ-ներկա-ապագա եռաչափության մեջ դիտարկելու ազգային, քաղաքական և քաղաքացիական ինքնությունների կոնվերգենցիան որպես հասարակության բնականոն արդիականացման պայման:**

**Բանալի բառեր.** քաղաքական արդիականացում, ժողովրդավարական անցում, քաղաքակրթական չափում, ազգային ինքնություն, էթնիկ ինքնություն, փափուկ ուժ, խելացի ուժ, տոլերանտություն, քաղաքական և քաղաքացիական ինքնություն, գիտավերլուծական հարացույց:

---

---

## ПРОБЛЕМЫ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТИ В ПРОЦЕССЕ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ МОДЕРНИЗАЦИИ

МАРИАМ МАРГАРЯН, ЛУСИНЕ НИКОГОСЯН

---

*Академия государственного управления Республики Армения*

---

В статье обосновывается теория политической модернизации как общая модель управления глобальными и глокальными политическими процессами. Исходя из логики “третьей волны” демократизации С. Хантингтона, авторы статьи систематически изучили механическую дихотомию “традиционных-современных” ценностей, векториальный характер (только либерализация) и “вестернизацию” процесса построения “современного общества”, что привело к онтологическим трансформациям. По мнению авторов, кризисы политического развития, вызванные последним, могут быть преодолены только цивилизованным измерением политической модернизации. Политическая модернизация определяется как процесс развития, институциональные изменения которого жизнеспособны, если они укрепляют политические институты и формируют политическое сознание граждан. В то же время существует обоснованное мнение, что с помощью новых информационно-коммуникационных технологий “мягкая сила”, как игрок в управлении этнической политикой, разрабатывает тексты и повестки политического развития, полные неточностей, создает различные сценарии толерантности. По мнению авторов, толерантность, как инструмент “мягкой силы”, не должна восприниматься как уступка и обеспечение формальной жизнеспособности политической власти путем механического отказа от этнонациональной идентичности. Предлагается осуществлять политическое управление с использованием научно-аналитической парадигмы, позволяющей рассматривать конвергенцию национальной, политической и гражданской идентичностей в трехмерности прошлое-настоящее-будущее как условие нормальной модернизации общества.

**Ключевые слова:** политическая модернизация, демократический переход, цивилизационное измерение, национальная идентичность, этническая идентичность, мягкая сила, умная сила, толерантность, политико-гражданская идентичность, научно-аналитическая парадигма.

*Ներկայացվել է խմբագրություն 15.03.2021  
Երաշխավորվել է տպագրության 22.04.2021*