

Розділ I. ІСТОРИКО-КУЛЬТУРНА РЕТРОСПЕКТИВА ЛЮДСЬКОЇ ТВОРЧОСТІ

УДК 321.7+316.752 (47+57)

THE DEMOCRATIC TRANSFORMATION AS A VALUE IN THE POSTCOMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Романенко Олена – кандидат політичних наук,
молодший науковий співробітник, Державна установа
«Інститут всевітньої історії НАН України», м. Київ
ORCID id 0000-0002-7434-0708
gelena.romanenko@gmail.com

The article presents the research of the scientists' ideas about analysis of political, social and information processes in European countries and shows the conditions and values necessarily for the development of the democracy in the new EU member states. Explain why different countries have developed heterogeneous despite of the similar historical and political conditions, the factors influencing on the dissimilar development of these states are defined. The basic models of postcommunist countries' transition to the democratic governance are represented; the new determinants for a successful transformation are given.

Key words: democracy, values, transformation, European integration, media

Communication «considered as a new phenomenon in human history that has a unique character, but the phenomenon still exists without its research» [1; 12-13]. It is studied within Political Science, Sociology (study of individuals or groups, the definition of interpersonal relations) within Mathematics (in quantitative research methods), Philosophy (rhetoric, logic), computer science and Linguistic (language learning, social communication, semiotics). This diversity is due to the fact that the new media, mobile network and mass media (including the Internet) grow faster than singled out separate field of study.

The aim of the article is to determine the assumptions that point the possibility of a free society creation and achievement democratic success in a country that was part of the «socialist camp», but had chosen the transformation towards democracy. Identify Ukraine's opportunities for such changes: a stable democracy in the country.

The following tasks arise from the goal: to analyze the works of scholars exploring the causes of the successful transformation of post-communist countries; to determine what prerequisites had led to successful transformation in the new EU member states, to determine what values caused this process what role playing media in these processes; to make recommendations for Ukraine.

Analysis of preconditions, indicating the possibility of a free society and democracy in the various countries and regions was based on the domestic and foreign scientists' thoughts and views. For example, Michael Mc Faul professor of political science at Stanford University, the author of books about the states' transition to a democratic regime. In the article, «*Transitions From Postcommunism*» [2] he examines the postcommunist countries' transformation to the democracy (including such country as Ukraine). He determines factors that contributed to the democratic success of Serbia in 2000, Georgia in 2003 and Ukraine in 2004, noting that «the generalization of these factors may be method of predicting the future democratic development, not only in this region but possibly to others» [2; 6].

The following preconditions indicating the possibility of a free society and country's democratic success: semi-authoritarian regime, the unpopularity of the ruling circles among the majority of citizens, united and organized opposition that can quickly react if the election results were rigged. In addition, M. McFaul determines such important factors as:

- sufficient number of independent mass media to inform citizens about the election falsification;
- the ability of the political opposition to mobilize tens of thousands or more demonstrators to protest the results;
- support or «ignoring» protests by «people with guns» (army, police, internal forces).

These factors are dominant in the cases of country's changes towards democracy, but the author names also a few another aspects. For example, the provision of the state in the transformation by financial, technical and ideological support from the West. This assistance was very helpful for countries that had moved from «communist states» to «the EU member states». The author underlies the opposition leader's key role, but at the

same time, ignores such factors as the level of economical development. He makes a note, that they do not play a special role in the democratic breakthrough of the postcommunist countries.

The democratic changes in the countries that joined the European Union, was made by the existence of all indicators from the above list. The existence of several key factors unlikely to trigger such a result (for example, the opposition will not be able to mobilize the population in sufficient quantity or dictator decides to use military forces against demonstrators). «Democratic breakthrough» by themselves cannot ensure success in processes of strengthening democracy. The scientist stressed that those countries that could use the sum of the above factors should start of continue active actions in domestic policy: it is need to be reformed; otherwise, the former regime may come back.

Ivan Krastev, the Head of the Center for Liberal Strategies in Sofia, Bulgaria explores the political transformation in the postcommunist countries and calls the reasons of populism success in these countries [4]: anger, unbridled hatred of the elites, the uncertainty of policy, cultural conservatism, radicalism, euroscepticism and anti-capitalism, nationalism, hidden xenophobia, anti-corruption rhetoric. I. Karstev describes populism as an ideology, in which the society singled out two opposing groups: «poor people» and «corrupt elite». Media in such societies are the means of political manipulation and influence.

One another famous researcher in the area of studying, Karol Jakubowicz explores the issue of media transformation in the postcommunist countries: the democratic standards which they have to implicate and what criteria they need to evaluate their progress in this area? Answers can be found in the article «*Going to Extremes? Two Polish Governments Deal with the Media*» [5]. K. Jakubowicz consider general aspects of the transformation process in Poland towards democracy, noting that in Central and Eastern Europe there are two models of Europe policy on mass media: «imitative» and «atavistic». The first model are copying the Western Europe pattern, the second – is a political control of the media (according to the practice that existed before 1989). In every country, these two models can be combined in different proportions.

In another Jakubowicz paper, called «*Rude Awakening. Social And Media Change In Central and Eastern Europe*» [5], Polish researcher says that many predictions that have been made on the postcommunist countries development of did not come true. At the same time, the majority of these countries have already passed the «point of no return» in theirs transformation and can not come back to the old (non-democratic) system. K. Jakubowicz's analysis of political, social and information processes in the European countries and the former «socialist camp» underlines the role of mass media in these processes. According to Jakubowicz, European countries can be divided into four groups:

- Competitive Democracy (to such system the author refers Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia).
- Concentrated political regimes (Ukraine, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia, Moldova, Russia, Kyrgyzstan).
- The postwar regimes (Armenia, Albania, Georgia, Macedonia, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina).
- Noncompetitive political regimes (which the author includes Kazakhstan, Belarus, the Republic of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan).

To explain why different countries have developed heterogeneous despite of the similar historical and political conditions, K. Jakubowicz studies the reasons of successful transformation in the postcommunist countries. Researcher identifies factors that influenced the development of the former Soviet bloc and defines two categories (A and B), referring to the internal factors that have led to uneven development in these countries (see Table 1).

Table 1 [5; 61]

Internal factors that led to the inhomogeneous development of post-communist countries	
«A» – factors (values) that contributed to the successful transformation of the country	«B» – factors that prevent development
The economic growth	Low living standards
High standards of education	Low education standards
Preservation of national and cultural traditions	The destruction of the national and cultural traditions
The existence of organized dissident movement	The resistance movement is weak or absent
The relatively tolerant attitude of the authorities to dissidents	Strict persecution of dissidents, the attempts to reform are failed
The ability of dissidents to unite many social groups for their purposes	Dissidents are in isolation

The existence of the reformist wing within the Communist Party	In the Communist Party are absent (or weak) liberal ideas
The experience of previous attempts to «descent from above» reforms	There are no previous attempts of reforms
The population is nationally or ethnically homogeneous	The existence of national (ethnic) conflict or unstable situation

The scientist stresses that the process of transformation in any country should be focused on the development of democracy and implementation of economic reforms, conflict resolution and have to an aim to unite the nation. National homogeneous determined as an important factor in the state development (K. Jakubowicz suggests such ethnically homogeneous country with a predominance of «A-factor» as: Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania). The appearance of any of the mentioned results in the countries, where there are many elements of «B-factors» is much smaller. In these countries are developing autocracies (in extreme cases – despotism or feudalism). The former political nomenclature or the oligarchs who control the economy are still existing, creating a «gray zone» and the black economy [5; 63-70].

K. Jakubowicz notes that the media can be a value for the future transformation. He presents four models of media market reform: direct communicative democracy; the model, close to the Western European; the Western European model and the model of media autonomization.

«Direct communicative democracy» – is a model that based on democratic principles of equality, mutual respect and solidarity. Politicians with different views rejected the provisions of this concept after the Soviet collapse. It happened because of changes in country’s strategy after replacing the cultural elite, due to the influence of capitalist-style economic management and the fulfillment of certain obligations to the international organizations.

In the countries of «A-type», by the opinion of K. Jakubowicz was abolished authoritarian system, but the principles of direct democracy were not involved in the empowerment of civil society. Instability, rapid changes and the politicization of all spheres of life led to a competition between different political actors for the media control. In the «B-type» remained autocratic system of governance (the oligarchs). The low role of civil society obstruct the existence of «direct democracy» model, turning mass media into «transmitters» of some political or economical groups of interests.

The main characteristics of «The model, close to the Western European» is freedom of speech and no censorship, anti-trust legislation in the field of mass communication, institutional autonomy of mass media (including the absence of an external audit), the media express a full range of opinion in the society [5; 67]. In the countries of «A-type» the law guarantees the independence of the media, but in fact only on paper. Social media face political and economic harassment. Free mass media are short-term and late commercialized. More strict the processes it is seen to occur in the countries with a «B-type».

«The Western European model» is aimed to regulate the old media system (abolition of censorship in the adoption new legislation, the abolition of the former state-monopoly on broadcasting), the transformation of old institutions into independent public broadcasting company (development of new laws, reliable financing of public television, ensure people, who monitor their activities). In the countries of «A-type» policies and political culture is important, but market and economic interests also affect the development of society.

«The model of media autonomization» based on privatization as a way for creating of free media. If in the countries of «A-type» this model exists and operates, in the country of «B-type» it could not be implemented due to the lack of a political culture, which is necessary for the stable monitoring of media, and because of the state’s impact. Local mass media have mixed forms of ownership, including public and private (usually hidden). Other factors in the «B-type» that prevent the implementation of this model are weak economy, the amoral actions of journalists, poverty and corruption.

Comparing the changes that have occurred in both types of the countries (see Table 2), K. Jakubowicz emphasizes the differences between them, showing their relation to the media (in particular, a sufficient number of independent mass media are to be proclaimed as prerequisite for democracy [6; 61]).

Table 2 [5, p.71]

Features of functioning of mass media in A-type and B-type countries

Indexes	«A-type» Countries	«B-type» Countries
The legal framework	A clear and strong	Weak, non systemic
The courts, the rule of law	Proclamation and respect freedom of speech and free expression. Media are protected by court	Formal freedom of speech (possible: censorship, economic sanctions, persecution, journalists’ murder)

Financing	Media are profitable, may use foreign investment	Foreign investment is not possible or possible only after a very complicated procedure
Political relations	Media publicly announce their political position, or indicate a publication’s customer	Political influence on the media do not publicize

For qualitative change in the system of mass communication in postcommunist countries, need to be done deep processes changing, especially in the countries of «B-type». K. Jakubowicz distinguishes such the five main phases of transformation: demonopolisation, autonomisation, decentralisation and democratisation of media and high level of professionalism of journalists [5; 70]. *Demonopolisation* is based on a fact that although in different countries there are national channels, the former dependence on a single source of information has disappeared after the opportunity to enjoy a variety of sources. *Autonomisation* from political, economic impacts, and subjectivity, religious, ethnic preferences is an important element of media reforming in the postcommunist countries. In the countries of «A-type» is set up supervisory bodies for compliance with the independence of mass media, in the country «B-type» democratic autonomy of media is only partial. *Decentralisation* also involves media «dispersal». Sometimes market forces cause the concentration of media at the local, regional or national levels. *Democratization* provides a free self-organization, media self-government, which become more accountable to the public and initiate dialogue with citizens about its future development. Although changes in the media space is impossible without raising the level of journalists’ professionalism.

In the next studies [7] to the mentioned above five stages required in post-communist countries K. Jakubowicz adds commercialization (clear understanding of the market), pluralization, development of public broadcasting, internationalization and globalization of media autonomy.

Freedom of the media are based on the three parameters:

1) independence from politics (in the authoritarian regimes it is impossible because of the complete subordination of the state mass media, censorship and administrative pressure, noncompetitive democracy using the media to influence on political opponents, many mass media are owned by oligarchs);

2) economic independence (impossible in the postcommunist countries due to the slow pace of economic reforms and the excessive number of media. To survive, the media «must find other sources of funding: government grants or money from political parties, local authorities, businesses and others. Financial dependence is expressed in the absence of editorial independence» [7; 7];

3) legal basis (laws) to ensure the independence of the media.

In terms of political pluralism mass media in the postcommunist countries in general can be divided into three groups: the authoritarian regimes, there is no real demonopolization of the media and therefore no political diversity of any kind; in noncompetitive regime media controlled by oligarchs and are used by competitors; competitive democracy creates real media diversity. The development of public broadcasting in post-communist countries is stopped by lack of appropriate social conditions, inability to maintain its financial autonomy and independence.

Media Internationalization has political, economic and cultural aspects that determine its pace and direction. This process depends on the circumstances in each country. Globalization is causing capital inflows in the media in Central and Eastern Europe. Some researchers mentioned a growing share of foreign media groups in these countries’ «colonization of the market» but K. Jakubowicz not accept this assertion [8]. In his view, this process was «not a colonization, as most CEE countries have opened the door to foreign investment in the media» [7; 10].

Thus, the scientist concludes that those countries which he assigned to the «A-type» become the new EU member states (Hungary, Republic of Poland, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, etc.). These countries have used the favorable conditions (presence of factors which are a prerequisite for democracy) and time to implement reforms. Although these countries are democratic and have become the part of the united Europe, in their domestic politic are still many controversies, including relations «the government – the media». For example, Adam Michnik, a Polish public figure, editor in chief of «Gazeta Wyborcza», compares Poland with Russia because these two countries have the examples of «attacks on the independent media, restrictions of civil society and the centralization of power» [9]. Writing about Poland he said that similar processes occur in other post-communist countries, everywhere «is the phenomenon of populism».

On such a problem says and Thomas Carothers, vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, USA. The researcher notes that «many countries are called transitive», instead of promoting democracy fall into two major mistakes, where democracy is superficial and actually exists in small

amounts, and one political party dominates the other [10; 10]. The first mistake is *feckless pluralism*: countries have regular elections, but democracy remains shallow and troubled. Political elites from all the major parties or groupings are corrupt, self-interested, and ineffective. They are widely perceived as corrupt and dishonest.

The second mistake in the gray zone is *dominant-power politics*. Countries have limited but still real political space, some political contestation by opposition groups, but one party (family, or a single leader) dominates the system in such a way that there appears to be little prospect of alternation of power in the foreseeable future [10; 11-12].

The basic processes and preconditions which are necessary for the development of democracy in a particular country researchers including the following factors: semi-state mode, the unpopularity of the ruling circles, united and organized opposition. Especially important for this process is the role of opposition leader. It is important that the prerequisites that indicate the possibility of a free society and democratic success in a particular country, the researchers not only include the ability of the political opposition to mobilize the masses, but also the need for a sufficient number of independent media to inform citizens. Speaking about Ukraine, there were indicated [6; 50] three major factors that support good prospects for independent mass media and are useful for further democratization of the country: a relatively strong civil society, changing or termination diverse interests of (mostly oligarchic) media owners and an international democratic community, which carefully observe and monitor developments in the country.

The researchers also stress that favorable factors for the democratic development are only the preconditions for its formation. However, for the future development the country should continuously improve internal policy and the interaction between state and society. Scientists emphasize that the countries that was part of the «socialist camp», but had chosen «the path towards democracy» as a value had already passed the «point of no return» in its transformation and cannot turn back to the old system.

For Ukraine democratic development and transformation is an important value but with numerous difficulties, including a series of reforms (education, healthcare and the legal system). Ukraine needs to restore faith in the ability of public political elite to overcome the challenges faced by each country in globalized world. It is also important to avoid «populist phenomenon» and be sure to have the country's extensive network of free commercial (private) and public media.

References

1. Mazur M. Marketing polityczny. Studium porównawcze. Warszawa: PWN, 2007. 360 s.
2. McFaul M. Transitions From Postcommunism. *Journal of Democracy*, 2005. Vol.16, №3. P. 5-19.
3. Krastev I. The new Europe: respectable populism, clockwork liberalism. URL: https://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-europe_constitution/new_europe_3376.jsp (дата звернення 11.11.2019)
4. Jakubowicz K. Going to Extremes? Two Polish Governments Deal with the Media. *Global Media Journal – Polish Edition*, 2008. №1 (4). P. 24–50.
5. Jakubowicz K. Rude Awakening. Social And Media Change in Central and Eastern Europe. *The Public*, 2001. Vol.8, №2. P. 59-80.
6. For example, Mykola Riabchuk in the article «Ukraine: Lessons Learned from Other Postcommunist Transitions» claims that «independent mass media play a crucial role in not only informing but also maturing society and defending it from the authoritarian tendencies of a dysfunctional state» [p. 61]. See Riabchuk M. Ukraine: Lessons Learned from Other Postcommunist Transitions. *Orbis*, 2008. №52 (1). P. 41-64.
7. Jakubowicz K. Post-communist media development in perspective. *Internat. Internationale Politikanalyse Europäische Politik*, 2005. März. P. 1–16.
8. Jakubowicz K. A new notion of media. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2009. 48 p.
9. Michnik A. Waiting for Freedom, Messing It Up. *The New York Times*. 2007. 25 March. URL: http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/25/opinion/25michnik.html?pagewanted=2&_r=1&en=6&ex=1181620800 (дата звернення 10.10.2019)
10. Carothers T. The end of the transition paradigm. *Journal of Democracy*, 2002. Vol 13, № 1. P. 5-20.

ДЕМОКРАТИЧНА ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ЯК ЦІННІСТЬ У ПОСТКОМУНІСТИЧНИХ КРАЇНАХ

Романенко Олена – кандидат політичних наук,
молодший науковий співробітник,
Державна установа «Інститут всесвітньої історії НАН України», м. Київ

Представлено дослідження ідей науковців, які аналізують політичні, соціальні та інформаційні процеси в європейських країнах та показують умови і цінності, необхідні для розвитку демократії в нових країнах-членах ЄС. Пояснюючи, чому різні країни розвиваються неоднорідно, незважаючи на подібні історичні та політичні умови, визначено фактори, що впливають на несхожий розвиток цих держав. Представлені основні моделі переходу посткомуністичних країн до демократичного управління, наведені нові детермінанти успішної трансформації.

Ключові слова: демократія, цінності, трансформація, євроінтеграція, медіа

ДЕМОКРАТИЧЕСКАЯ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ КАК ЦЕННОСТЬ В ПОСТКОМУНИСТИЧЕСКИХ СТРАНАХ

Романенко Елена – кандидат политических наук, младший научный сотрудник,
Государственное учреждение «Институт всемирной истории НАН Украины», г. Киев

Представлено исследование идей ученых, анализирующих политические, социальные и информационные процессы в европейских странах и показывающие условия и ценности, необходимые для развития демократии в новых странах-членах ЕС. Объясняя, почему разные страны развиваются неоднородно, несмотря на подобные исторические и политические условия, определены факторы, влияющие на непохожий развитие этих государств. Представлены основные модели перехода посткоммунистических стран к демократическому управлению, приведены новые детерминанты успешной трансформации.

Ключевые слова: демократия, ценности, трансформация, евроинтеграция, медиа

UDC 321.7+316.752(47+57)

THE DEMOCRATIC TRANSFORMATION AS A VALUE IN THE POSTCOMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Romanenko Olena – PhD (political science), Junior Research Fellow, The State Institution «Institute of World History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine», Kyiv

Мета даної роботи – представити дослідження ідей науковців, які аналізують політичні, соціальні та інформаційні процеси в європейських країнах та показують умови та цінності, необхідні для розвитку демократії в нових країнах-членах ЄС. **Завдання:** проаналізувати праці вчених, що досліджують причини успішної трансформації посткомуністичних країн, визначити, передумови, що призвели до цих процесів у нових країнах-членах ЄС, визначити, цінності, що спричинили ці зміни та яку роль відіграють засоби масової комунікації у цих процесах, дати рекомендації для України.

Методологія дослідження. Розглянуті публікації (наукові публікації та видання, журнали та статті у міжнародних ЗМК) науковців й експертів із даної теми. Проведено аналіз передумов, що свідчать про можливість створення вільного суспільства та демократії в різних країнах і регіонах.

Результати. Пояснено, чому різні країни розвивалися неоднорідно, незважаючи на схожі історичні та політичні передумови. Визначено фактори, що впливають на неоднорідний розвиток цих країн. Говорячи про Україну, названо три основні фактори, які підтримують хороші перспективи незалежних ЗМК та є корисними для подальшої демократизації країни: відносно сильне громадянське суспільство, зміна інтересів власників ЗМК та моніторинг міжнародним демократичним співтовариством подій в країні.

Новизна. Здійснена спроба висунути припущення, які вказують на успішну можливість створення вільного суспільства та досягнення демократичного успіху в країнах, які раніше входили до «соціалістичного табору», але пізніше обрали шлях до демократії. Наведено визначення подібної можливості для України, вказано, яких потрібно досягти змін, щоб мати діючу стабільну демократію в країні як одну з пріоритетних цінностей суспільства.

Практичне значення. Представлені основні моделі переходу посткомуністичних країн до демократичного управління, наведені нові детермінанти успішної трансформації цих країн, визначено роль медіа як однієї з основних цінностей для розвитку демократичного суспільства.

Ключові слова. демократія, цінності, трансформація, європейська інтеграція, засоби масової комунікації.

Надійшла до редакції 2.10.2019 р.