

Developing Of The Modernization Paradigm And The Ideas Of Neoconvergence After The Global Crisis Covid 19

Khakim Tukhtaev¹, h_tuxtayev@nuu.uz
Mavluda Yokubova¹, y_mavluda@nuu.uz
Dilmurod Ernazarov², d.ernazarov@tsue.uz
Mirkomil Atavullaev¹, m_atavullayev@nuu.uz
Tunis Khojiev^{1,3}, x_tunis@nuu.uz

¹ National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek Republic of Uzbekistan

² Tashkent State University of Economics Republic of Uzbekistan

³ Editor at Portal International Scientific Journals Tadqiqot.uz Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstraction: *The authors attempt to analyze the emergence and development of the modernization paradigm in social and humanitarian science, its transformation from the description of society's transition from traditional to modern to the formulation of the principles of "catch-up" development of third world countries. Furthermore, the authors try to illustrate the limitations of the society of modernity and model of modernization development that determined rethinking of the theory of social modernization from the point of view of the threats and challenges for the future of human civilization. Modern society is experiencing a new phase of changes; its specificity is described by the concept of the risk society and reflexive modernization. The authors emphasize the special role of philosophy in the process of becoming reflexive attitude of the individual and society to modernization and risks.*

Keywords: *COVID 19, human health, medical ethics, digital medicine, social modernization, industrialization, secondary modernization, critique of modernization theory, risk society, reflexive modernization.*

1. Introduction

In 20th century, the notion of modernization, as an aggregate of "economical, demographic, psychological and political changes, which a traditional society faces in the process of its transformation" [9] acquired paradigm status among the socio-theoretical studies around the globe. Despite the critiques from various conceptual and historical positions, the modernization model of development remains quite popular both on the level of public opinion and on that of political elites. However, it must be noted, that the present views on modernization differs significantly from classical views on modernization, therefore, the present modernization processes can collectively be also called postmodern, and the whole process can be called "postmodernism" [2]. This created the need for the theoretical-methodological analysis of the occurred transformations of the paradigms of modernization.

One of the classics of social thought, the one who established the cornerstone of our notions on modernization as a process of transition from traditional society to a modern one, was a French socialist and social philosopher Émile Durkheim, who in his work *The Division of Labor in Society* (*De la Division du Travail Social*, 1893) presents the peculiarities of social relations or "solidarity" as a criterion for distinguishing the two types of society. The traditional society is characterized by "mechanical solidarity", i. e. a simple aggregate of social "clans", while the modern society – by "organic solidarity", and the systemacy and

unity of functional diversity. The organization of modern society is quite complex, but it fulfills more efficiently the needs and requirements of people. Durkheim analyzed and identified many problems and topics, which are still relevant in the philosophical and scientific understanding of the social changes, such as role of the individual, state and the rights, the transformation of values, the changes in the status of the religion and morals, the influence of scientific and technological advances on the social relations and others [6].

Review of the literature on the topic

In the works of Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, Émile Durkheim, Max Weber, Ferdinand Tönnies, George Simmel, significant focus was directed at the epochal social transformations, which occur in the periods of transition of societies from traditional agrarian to industrial modes. In the mid-20th century, on conceptual-theoretical level (in the works of Raymond Aron, W. Whitman Rostow, John Kenneth Galbraith, for instance) the result of the process of social modernization is seen as the formation of industrial society with such important characteristics as scientific-technological advancement, urbanization, high degree of differentiation of social roles and institutions, social mobility; in the sphere of economy those characteristics was replenished with the ones, such as completed industrialization and mass production; and in politics – bureaucratization, fixation of democratic institutions and institutions of civic society; mass enculturation and education; rationalization of every branch of the lives of the people and others. The issue of rounding up the processes of modernization of Uzbekistan has been studied to some extent during the years of independence. Such studies reveal the history of Uzbekistan's modernization processes, not in a holistic manner, but in separate areas. Furthermore, in the monographs, brochures and articles of Juraev N., Jakbarov M., A.Kadyrov, A.A. Azizkhodjaev, Nazarov K.N., Boboev H., Jumaev R., Musaev F.A., Otamurotov S.O., Ergashev I., Kyrgyzbaev M., Abdullaeva M.N., Amanov B., this issue has been deeply analyzed.

2. Research methodology

During the research, the following general and philosophical methods were used: historical, objectivity, abstraction, concrete, systematic analysis, comparative analysis.

3. Analysis and Results

The criteria for the industrial societies can differ from author to author, but they are all virtually compatible with the forming paradigm of modernization. Main attention is given to the modernization of value foundations of social life, and to the transition from collectivism to individualism. The highest value of the individual freedom of rational person is postulated, which is to be realized via practice in transforming the world around the man, the nature, in enterprise or in socio-political life, it is to reveal itself by overcoming the traditional irrationalism and stagnancy. “The transition of traditionalism to modernity is interpreted as individualization (the individual, rather than a group, is gradually considered as the basic social unit); differentiation (the transfer of certain functions, which belonged to “family”, to specialized social institutions) and formalization (an approach to social institutions as functioning on the basis of abstract and universal laws and rules, facilitating the dominant role of science and expertise)” [9].

Second quarter of the 20th century became the most important stage of the development of the paradigm of modernization, and it created, at least in theory, an opportunity to define and describe the occurring phenomena and to be the conceptual basis for the construction of new social systems. This is mainly associated with the emergence of new independent states out of previous colonies, which purposefully chose the model of Western European modernization. The phenomenon of distinguishing the “primary” and the “secondary” types

of modernization has witnessed a rather curious proliferation recently. Primary modernization – is, as we mentioned above, the natural-historical process of transition of European societies from agrarian-traditional type to modern industrial society. Primary modernization can also be called natural, classic, spontaneous, “vanguard modernization” and so forth. The secondary modernization has also assumed such characteristics, but it was predominantly realized in third world countries in order to overcome, first of all, the economical lag these countries witnessing in relation to the Western nations, therefore, if these processes assumed simple duplication, and borrowing of western values, technological advances, and lifestyle the secondary modernization has also been called “catch-up” modernization or “westernization”.

Chief aim of the project of modernization with respect to third world countries is associated with the solution of important problems: the problem of malnutrition, diseases and illiteracy – but, in the end the gap between wealthy and poor countries only increased, and the problems we mentioned above have been joined by much more malicious ones, such as armed conflicts, corruption, and the threats of the ecological catastrophe on a global scale. Secondary or “pursuing” modernization has become main factor of regional instability. Let us look at this phenomenon in the instance of a certain region. The countries of Southern and South-Eastern Asia can be examples of the consequences of secondary modernization. The socio-economic modernization in these countries invoked a number of problems, the most apparent one of those problems – rapid demographical growth complicated the economic position of these countries and contributed to the exacerbation of ecological problems in the region. In Bangladesh, for instance, we can see that there is a complicated situation associated with the negative combination of regional and global problems. Industrialization only covered a small part of the country and the population (garment industry in large cities), and could not provide the fast-growing population with the material wellbeing. Big portion of the population is in poverty, illiterate, and employed in agriculture (primitive natural production), which forces them to deplete the soil; cut forests and pollute the water. As a result, the demographical growth puts strain on the economy of the country and destroys the natural environment. This is accompanied by high susceptibility to various natural disasters (floods and droughts), in addition the external anthropogenic factors regarding Bangladesh (ecology of India, global climate change and rise in the ocean levels).

At present, India is demonstrating features of a certain maturity in democratic institutions, fast pace of economic growth; she successfully implemented industrialization and developing all of the primary branches of production – from heavy mining and processing industry to atomic power engineering, astronautics, and modern IT spheres. This development was ensured by internal (by exploitation of natural resources and cheap labor force) as well as external (by the investment of developed countries) sources. However, majority of the population is employed in agriculture, resides in rural areas and leads traditional lifestyles. The main problem of India is, in our opinion, that the fast growth of the economy, which was not equipped with high-performance and environmentally-friendly technologies, combined with the demographical growth, requires huge resources, the consumption of which destroys the environment of the country, and the norms and rules of ecological safety is not abided because of the scarce financing, the absence of political support or the effective law enforcement. India cannot turn away from the model of modernizational development, her one of the most priority tasks is to raise the living conditions of her people, a quarter of which lives in poverty. In this case, the economic growth is not capable of “catching up” and overtaking the demographical growth, but it can provide the ecosystem of the country with better chances at maintaining and recovering itself, which can lead to unprecedented and unpredictable consequences. The instance of India is very meaningful, because the development of the country in a way “pursuing” model of

modernization can lead to the rise of regional instability, and considering the size of India and her neighbors, it is not without its grounds to say that it can stimulate the global instability [1].

Finally, city-state of Singapore is now presenting an example of secondary modernization, now it is a modern postindustrial society with an advanced-technology based industry and harsh eco-safety regulations. Presently, Singapore has practically total control over the demographical situation, and developing most innovative “green” and biotech production and achieved immense successes in recycling and reusing industrial residues. But, since Singapore covers only a small area, and it provided the wellbeing for its citizens partly through exploitation of other countries and their resources, it does not determine the course of ecologic situation on a regional, let alone the global level.

The analysis of the development of above-mentioned states allows us to highlight a number of ecological problems, caused by accelerated social-economic modernization [5]. The depletion of natural resources and ecological crises became the main arguments of the critiques against the paradigms of modernization both by national interests of individual states, and from the perspective of human civilization in general (this process started with the report of the Club of Rome – “The Limits to Growth”). Multiple threats and calls, caused by industrialization, technological advances, individualization and rationalization, predetermined reconsidering the paradigms of modernization from the perspective of the problems of risk.

Interest to the topic of risk from the research groups is constantly on the rise. The societies of developed countries, after the achievement of sufficient living standards and domestic comfort, are now seriously concerned with various (i. e. ecological, terroristic, and economic) threats, which can destabilize these favorable conditions [7]. This statement is true both for an ordinary inhabitant (a voter or taxpayer), which constitute overwhelming majority of any society, or for the members of higher classes – main beneficiaries of economic growth. The desire to foresee and prevent threats forms appropriate demand for science responsible for formulation of knowledge and forecasts, demand for politics, responsible for maintaining security, which uses fear in order to secure its authority, demand for economy, which meets demands for the sense of stability and security with its high profits. Secondly, increasing attention to risks is determined by the scale of this problem. Risks globalize, outgrow the borders of social groups, states or other spheres of life, and assume universality, generality and validity. Thirdly, a major factor, stipulating the present society as “risk society”, is informatization – rapid growth of the knowledge itself, the means of its storage, transmission and replication. Only information society can be the “risk society”: “Along with the development of the risk society increases the antagonism between the ones who are liable to risks and the ones who make profit out of it. Accordingly, the social and political importance of knowledge and the authority over the communication mediums of acquiring knowledge (sciences) and its propagation increase (mass media). In that respect, the risk society – is the society of science, and communication and information mediums” [3, p. 34].

Thus, we can observe heightened interest and demand from society concerning the risks, the growth of number and scale of the research of risks, the growth of the financing of scientific researches on the analysis and assessment of risks, and formation of new type of specialists – experts on risks. There are two major types of interpretation of the notion of risk, and they are closely interrelated: 1) risk is – expected damage, potential danger, and even threat; 2) risk – is a certain probability of the approach of negative and unwanted consequences. The first interpretation is popular among the ordinary minds of everyday people and associated with people’s views about the future. The second – serves as a basis for scientific researches, in which risk is a quantitative characteristic, concerning the present; the knowledge about risk is used in planning the current course of action, or in projecting. There are many types of risks; the scientific literature contains various classifications of them, for

instance: there are natural, technological, social, and medical risks. Also, by various standards, we can point out financial, credit, monetary, technical, professional, individual, collective, admissible or permissible, or justified, geopolitical, and market risks. For instance, R. Kolluru lists following types of risks: safety risks, health risks, environmental risks, public welfare and goodwill risks, and financial risks [13]. The problem is that, risks from one sphere or activity, if we look at the problem as a system of complex and intricate interaction with many different, interrelated parts, intersects and interacts with ecological or social spheres, and global environmental risks triggers risks of almost every aspect of human and social life [5].

Our present understanding of risks is directly related with the special features of human activity, which assumes task oriented activity and reflection on its results, assessment, planning, expectation etc. In this sense, human activity (especially the creative work) is always prone to risks; it is implemented taking into consideration the novelty and unpredictability of the results, and the probability of negative consequences. *On present conditions, risks becomes a major ideological basis of the mobilization of efforts for realization of the new stage of modernization, it comes to substitute the values of personal freedom, inviolability of private property and the priority of profit, ideals of scientific rationalization, and national interests – in short, all, on which the “first” modern was built.* Risks, information technologies and globalization, which are closely related with each other, form a new contemporaneity. In this contemporaneity following can happen:

- Universalization of risk, when the danger of disaster hangs over each and every person, regardless of their social status or ethnic background;
- Globalization of risk, encompassing huge masses of people across the whole planet;
- Institutionalization of risk, related with the emergence of organizations, main occupation of which is to work on the risks and make profit out of them;
- Reinforcement and increase of risks as a result of the side effects of human activity [12, p. 117].

One of the most important characteristics of modern society, in which the risks occupy a central position, is reflexivity: “The process of modernization becomes “reflexive”, that is, it becomes its own topic and problem. To the line of the questions of development and the usage of technologies (in natural, social and personal spheres) is added the question of political and scientific “handling” (detecting, preventing, hiding, and managing) of the risks, which carries already existing or potential technologies to the expected future” [3, p. 22]. Reflexivity, in this situation, is understood as conscious interaction with risks by society in general and each individual in particular, and at the same time, the realization of risks and forming a certain position for interacting or “negotiating” with them becomes a major scientific, socio-political, and economic task.

Reflexive character of the society of “other modern” is determined by the “intelligibility” of the risks themselves in the sense, that the threats to human life from the factors of environment that is not visible to the eyes are being discovered with the advancement of scientific researches, and the assessment of these researches. The risks are felt in present, but they refer to the sphere of future, which is construed by scientific and pseudo-scientific hypotheses, and speculations of politicians and journalists. The scientific progress is responsible for the emergence of risks, however, only the scientific expertise allows us to expose them, but in assessment of the risks the science loses its autonomy and tangles into various political and economic conflicts and interests. Researches, devoted to a certain kind of risks, inevitably stumble upon the questions of causes of danger and the subjects responsible for them, and the questions of their level of danger: permissible norms of contamination, contents of poisons, radiation background. These questions outgrow the classical scientific rationality and ethics and reaches to the borders of economic lobbying, and

political interests. The solution to these questions is always halfway, and does not have any real connection to objectivity. Thus, the study of risks is included in general reflexivity, in socio-cultural context of concrete historical moment and concrete society, and is operates with the categories of social equality (opportunities, levels of safety, access to information, responsibility, etc.), justice, humanity, expediency, and with it, it is immersed in the traditional sphere of responsibility in philosophy.

Other aspect of approaching the reflexivity of the modern is the analysis of individual existence, which assumes all the greater autonomy and independence from social institutions and traditional forms of spirituality. Individualization is realized as a liberation from social-class relationships and gender roles, but does not lead to the ideals of emancipation, for the person is captured within the structure of “institutional-dependent individual situations”, which presents as a system of relationships between an individual and systems of education, market, labor, legal systems, consumer market, and service sphere. Individualization means that the life of an individual is liberated from fixed systems of coordinates and presents as an individual task, which is dependent only of its solution. In contemporary society, spectrum of potential life-scenarios, determined by personal choice, considerably expands, and what before determined by social status, now becomes the result of the reflexive attitude towards the self and the conditions of existence. For instance, the decisions about the choice of the direction of education, profession, place of employment, and place of residence, about the choice of partner, the number of children not only can be made consciously and independently, but also *must be* made. Certainly, we can always question the level of consciousness and independence of these decisions, but, modern society is leaving exactly these decisions to the will of an individual none the less. The consequences of the decisions that were made and were not made, completely rests on the shoulders of the individual. The question is: to what extent a young individual can assess the risks of his or her existence and construct the future life accordingly?

4. Conclusions and Suggestions

We live in an era of information, and each of us has opportunity to get the information on issues of our interests. However, in an open pluralistic information space, there is a battle going on among the expert communities, specializing in providing the mass of people with information, and constantly in an effort to acquire more minds and attention. One has to choose and critically analyze for himself the choice of certain course of action. The philosophy must play its due role in this process, for it possesses a huge potential for critical and reflexive rationality. Philosophy has an immense experience in the complex analysis of human existence, and philosophical education allows to critical rethinking of this experience in the context of contemporary socio-cultural and individual situation. Philosophical reflection is a main component of the reflexive modernization both on the social or communal level and on the level of individual consciousness. No doubt, philosophy is not in the position to substitute the science in expert assessment of the risks, in calculating the consequences of modernization, for it cannot substitute expert political and managerial decisions. The function of philosophy lies in other parts, namely:

- To present a constructive critique of scientific rationality, preventing the science from dogmatism, politicization, commercialization, and defend the science from the irrational critiques of pseudo-science.
- To form skills of reflexive attitude towards individual’s own life, to present itself as an immunity against pseudo-science for ordinary people, who need to remain critical in the face of conflicting information, calls and slogans.

It must be noted with a sorrow that, the proportion of philosophy in education system is constantly diminishing, and hence diminishing the potential of reflexive attitude towards life and constructive behavior in conditions of heightened risk.

Thus, in the context of global socio-environmental instability, and the formation of global risk society, the paradigm of modernization requires a serious rethinking. Globalization and universalization of risks, real terrorist threats, wars, epidemics and environmental catastrophes urges the contemporary society to turn down the postulate of inviolability of ideals and principles of the classical version of modernization project: individual liberty, the liberty of enterprise and market, sovereignty of nation states, technological and social progress. The reflexive way of development suggests the variability of the projects of national modernization, post- and anti-modernization. The need of optimizing the mechanisms of managing the global processes by international strictures and organizations becoming more urgent, the scientific and philosophical knowledge, offering a complex view of intricate and interrelated situation and the grounded prediction of its way of development and constructive ways out of the crisis are becoming all the more essential. Global situation, which formed at the dawn of third millennium, requires from humanity special responsibility and unprecedented practical courses of action, both in the sphere of socio-natural exchange, and in relationships between the heads of various cultures with the purpose of sustainable development and civilization of future.

5. REFERENCES

1. Annayev, A. Ecology: pitfalls of the economic development of India / A. Annayev // *Asia and Africa today*. - 2010. - No. 4. - P. 54-55.
2. Anokhina, VV Postmodernization as a new type of social transformations / VV Anokhina // *Dialogue of civilizations in the context of global environmental instability: materials of Intern. scientific. conf. young scientists.*, Minsk, May 24, 2012 [Electronic resource] / editorial board: A. I. Zelenkov [and others]. - *Electron. text data*. - Minsk, 2013. - pp. 147—154.
3. Beck, W. Risk Society. On the way to another modernity / U. Beck. - M., 2000.
4. Giddens, E. Consequences of modernity / E. Giddens. - M., 2001.
5. Dobrorodniy, DG The problem of the relationship between environmental and demographic factors of socio-economic modernization // *Intellectual culture of Belarus: knowledge management in the context of the tasks of socio-economic modernization: materials of the second Intern. scientific. conf.*, Minsk, 12-13 nov. 2015 / Institute of Philosophy of the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus. - Minsk, 2016. - P. 224-226.
6. Durkheim, E. On the division of social labor / E. Durkheim. - M., 1996.
7. Ivanchenko, GV Uncertainty and risk as anthropological constants of our time / GV Ivanchenko // *Knowledge. Understanding. Skill*. - 2006. - No. 4. - P. 205—207.
8. Matveenکو, Yu. I. Modernization: theory and modernity / Yu. I. Matveenکو // *Izv. Toole. state un-that. Humanities. science*. - 2012. - Issue. 1, part 1. - S. 153-164.
9. Polyakov, L. V. Social modernization / L. V. Polyakov // *New philosophical encyclopedia: in 4 volumes* / Institute of Philosophy RAS; Nat. socio-scientific fund; representative of scientific-ed. Council V.S.Stepin. - M., 2000-2001 [Electronic resource]. - Access mode: <http://iphras.ru/elib/1936.html>. - Date of access: 09/10/2016.
10. Fedotova, VG New trends in understanding modernization / VG Fedotova // *New issled. Tuva*. - 2009. - No. 1-2. - S. 18-29.
11. Fedotova, VG Typology of modernizations and methods of their study / VG Fedotova // *Vopr. philosophy*. - 2000. - No. 4. - P. 8-19.
12. Shtompka, P. Sociology of social change / P. Shtompka. - M. 1996.

13. Kolluru, R. V. Health Risk Assessment: Principles and Practices / R. V. Kolluru // Risk Assessment and Management Handbook. For Environmental, Health, and Safety Professionals. - New York, 1996. - P. 123-151.