

УДК 316. 332

Ganeeva K.V.

WESTERN AND NON-WESTERN ROUTES IN THE MANAGEMENT

У статті зроблена спроба розкрити комплекс ризиків, що виникають перед суспільством в умовах глобалізації. Автор розглядає можливі шляхи прийняття управлінських рішень та стратегій управління за умов соціальних, економічних та політичних потрясінь, порівнює західні моделі та ті, що використовуються в країнах пострадянського простору.

Ключові слова: глобалізація, модернізація, соціальні перетворення, управління, криза.

В статье сделана попытка раскрыть комплекс рисков, которые возникают перед обществом в условиях глобализации. Автор рассматривает возможные пути принятия управленческих решений и стратегий управления в условиях социальных, экономических и политических потрясений, сравнивает западные модели с использующимися в странах постсоветского пространства.

Ключевые слова: глобализация, модернизация, социальные преобразования, управление, кризис.

The article is an attempt to reveal the complex risks confronting society in the context of globalization. The author reviews the possible ways of making upravlenčiskih decisions and management strategies in the social, economic, and political turbulence, compares the Western model used in the countries of the post-Soviet space.

Key words: globalization, modernization, social transformation, upravoenie, crisis.

The twenty – first century will surely be one of continuing social, economic, and political turmoil and challenge, at least in its early decades. What A. Zinov'ev have called the age of social transformation is not over yet. And the challenges looming ahead may be more serious and more daunting than those posed by the social transformations that have already come about, the social transformations of the twentieth century.

Yet we will not even have a chance to resolve these new and looming problems of tomorrow unless we first address the challenges posed by the developments that are already accomplished facts, the developments reported in the earlier sections of this essay. These are the priority tasks. For only if they are tackled can we in the developed democratic free-market countries hope to have the social cohesion, the economic strength,

and the governmental capacity needed to tackle the new challenges. The first order of business – for sociologists, political scientists, and economists; for educators; for business executives, politicians, and nonprofit-group leaders; for people in all walks of life, as parents, as employees, as citizens – is to work on these priority tasks, for few of which we so far have a precedent, let alone tested solutions.

The Western experience of industrialization was the model for world industrialization. To become modern was to become something like Western industrial society. Non-Western societies were not always given much choice in the matter. As formal colonies or informal clients of Western powers, they often found themselves being “developed” in a Western direction before they were permitted to take political control of their own destinies. Once on the way, there was no turning back. But, even where an element of choice existed, it remained the consensus that the only viable form of society in the modern world was industrial society. Only industrial societies could be active agents in the world system. All others must remain clients or dependents. Japan demonstrated this better than any other nation. From a poor nation humiliated at the hands of the West in the mid-19th century, Japan rose through industrialization to become one of the most powerful societies in the world. More pointedly, Japan showed that, by meeting the challenge of industrialization, a non-Western society could become not merely the equal but the superior of some of the strongest Western powers.

Japan confirmed what Western experience had already made clear: There are several routes to modernity. In the 19th century Britain, Belgium, France, and the United States industrialized largely on the basis of the individual entrepreneur and the free market economy. In Germany, and even more in Japan, the state and political elites played a major role, organizing credit, coordinating and planning development, and restricting foreign access to home markets in the interests of native industry. Later still came the even more centralized authoritarian model of modernization under the aegis of the one-party state. Taking their lead from the Soviet Union following the Russian Revolution of 1917, many developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America sought to industrialize according to economic plans drawn up by political elites and stringently imposed on their populations. Even where, as in India, formal liberal democracy was instituted, industrialization was largely guided by a single national party usually the one identified with the struggle for independence from colonial rule, as was the Indian National Congress party. In any case, there were plenty of socialisms to choose from. There were the African socialisms of Kwame Nkrumah’s Ghana and Julius Nyerere’s Tanzania, the Chinese socialism of Mao Zedong, the Cuban socialism of Fidel

Castro, or the Yugoslav socialism of Josip Broz Tito. All could aspire to be models of development to Third World societies. None, however, were able to achieve successful records of economic development under central planning [3, p. 38].

Japan and the Soviet Union (until its dissolution in 1991) suggested, in their different ways, that there was a general pattern of late development appropriate to all those nations that attempted to industrialize in the shadow of already formidable industrial powers. This pattern variously involved strong protectionism, directed labor, control of unions, and central supervision of banking and credit. It also meant circumventing the sharp division between management and workers that hampered most early Western industrializers and that continued to worry them in their later industrial history. Above all, late developers put the power of the state at the centre of the modernizing effort. The state was the prime mover and guardian of the whole enterprise. Unlike Britain or the United States, where the state at any rate in the early stage-encouraged development more or less passively, keeping the peace and enforcing the laws and perhaps arranging for some free land (as for the railroads in the United States), in countries such as Japan, the former Soviet Union, and China the state directed the industrializing process from the start and supervised it closely throughout. The state made the major decisions about investment, transport and communications, and education. It developed the media of mass communications as agencies of mass socialization. Therefore, whether or not the economy was formally nationalized, in practice economic development was placed firmly under national auspices and directed to nationalist ends.

Japan and Singapore have been, so far, the only non-Western countries in the world to become fully industrialized (though South Korea and Taiwan are well on their way). It may be significant that those countries embarked on industrialization in the 19-th century, while the West was still itself industrializing and before it had built up a truly commanding lead. The same is true of Russia, the only other major case of industrialization outside western Europe and North America (taking South Africa and Australia as “European”). In the 20th century it became increasingly clear that industrialization is not something that nations can decide to do or how to do entirely by themselves. They operate within a context of world industrialization, in a world system of states of decidedly unequal wealth and power. This system provides both constraints and opportunities for the economic development of the states within it [2. c. 108].

Japan and Singapore have been, so far, the only non-Western countries in the world to become fully industrialized (though South Korea

and Taiwan are well on their way). It may be significant that those countries embarked on industrialization in the 19th century, while the West was still itself industrializing and before it had built up a truly commanding lead. The same is true of Russia, the only other major case of industrialization outside western Europe and North America (taking South Africa and Australia as «European»). In the 20th century it became increasingly clear that industrialization is not something that nations can decide to do or how to do entirely by themselves. They operate within a context of world industrialization, in a world system of states of decidedly unequal wealth and power. This system provides both constraints and opportunities for the economic development of the states within it.

Industrialism, at least within our experience of it for more than 200 years, never reaches a point of equilibrium or a level plateau. By its very principle of operation, it ceaselessly innovates and changes. Having largely eliminated the agricultural workforce, it moves on manufacturing employment by creating new automated technology that increases manufacturing productivity while displacing workers. Manufacturing, from accounting for a half or more of the employed population of industrial societies, shrinks to between a quarter and a third. Its place is filled by the service sector, which in fully industrial societies comes to employ between a half and two-thirds of the workforce and to account for more than half of the gross national product. Most service occupations in government, health, education, finance, leisure and entertainment are white-collar. The typical industrial worker is now not the blue-collar worker but the white-collar worker [1, c. 70].

The move to a service society is marked by a great expansion in education, health, and other private and public welfare services. The population typically becomes not just healthier, better housed, and better fed but also better educated. Most young people complete secondary- or high-school education; between a quarter and a half of them go on to full-time higher education. Professional and scientific knowledge becomes the most marketable commodity. The “knowledge class” of professional, scientific, and technical workers becomes the fastest-growing occupational group. The link between pure science and technology, loose and uncertain in the early stages of industrialization, becomes pivotal. New industries, starting with chemicals and pharmaceuticals and later including the aeronautical, space, and computer-related industries, are created by developments in pure science and depend largely on theoretical research. Theoretical knowledge in the social sciences also comes to be widely applied, as in Keynesian management of the national economy and in complex models of technological and economic forecasting.

Most of the changes characterizing late industrialism can be seen as the results of long-term developments implicit in the process of industrialization itself. The rise of service industries has emerged in part from the increase in leisure and in disposable wealth and in part from the continuing process of mechanization and technical innovation, which constantly raises manufacturing productivity by replacing human labor with machines. It can also be seen as the consequence of the growth of multinational corporations; this, too, is the result of the increase in scale and complexity of industrial organization, a clear tendency from the very start. The growth of knowledge-based industries is most clearly an outcome of investments in the depth and breadth of education, particularly in science and mathematics. Science has always been at the base of industrialism, and its closer union with industry and society in the 20-th century was simply the fulfillment of modernization's rationalizing drive.

Many features of modernity, intensified beyond a certain level, produce a reactive response. Urbanization, having reached some practical saturation point, leads to suburbanization, the desire to live in neighbourhoods with green spaces and at least a breath of country air. As the suburbs fill up, the more prosperous citizens become exurban: they colonize the villages and small towns of the countryside within commuting distance of their work in the city. Aiding this trend is the industrial decentralization and depopulation of many cities as old manufacturing industries decline and new service industries move out to the suburbs and small towns. For the first time since the onset of industrialization, the countryside begins to gain population and the cities begin to lose it. According to the 1980 U.S. census, cities such as St. Louis, Buffalo, and Detroit lost between 35 and 47 percent of their populations over a 30-year period. London lost almost 15 percent of the population of its inner boroughs between 1961 and 1971, and Liverpool almost 25 percent of its population in the 20-year period to 1971 [4, p. 213].

But there is a deceptive aspect to this movement. The familiar forces of industrialism, here as elsewhere, continue to dominate the process. Suburbanization and exurbanization do not mean deurbanization. On the contrary, they amount to a spreading of urban life over greater and greater areas. They are simply the filling up, at lesser but still urban densities, of larger areas and regions. From the old city develops the metropolitan area, comprising a large city of about 10 million people together with a surrounding community socially and economically dependent on it. The metropolitan areas themselves tend to merge into even larger urban agglomerations, the megalopolises, which serve populations of 40 million or more. The biggest of these is «Boswash», the chain of contiguous cities and surrounding regions that stretches from Boston to Washington, D.C.,

along the northeastern seaboard of the United States. Others in the United States include the Chicago–Pittsburgh area around the Great Lakes and the San Francisco–San Diego region along the California coast. There are emerging megalopolises in Britain in the region between London and the Midland cities, in Germany in the industrial basin of the Ruhr, and in Japan in the Tokyo–Osaka–Kyōto complex.

The Greek architect and city planner Constantinos Apostolos Doxiadis argued that this process is part of a long-term evolution that must eventually culminate in the world-city, or “Ecumenopolis.” This remarkable object will incorporate areas reserved for recreation and agriculture as well as desert and wilderness conservation areas, but essentially it will be a web of interconnected cities throughout the world, all closely linked by rapid transport and electronic communication, and all contributing to a single functional unity. In Ecumenopolis the entire land surface of the globe will have become recognizably the dwelling place of urbanized humanity.

Embedded in this process is a contradictory pattern typical of late industrial life. Subjectively, individuals wish to escape from the city. They leave the congested and declining older urban centres only to find themselves cocooned by larger urban structures in the region at large. The objective structural forces of industrialism have in no way abated. But increasingly they give rise to reactions and behaviour that have a de-modernizing character.

Thus there is reaction against large-scale bureaucratic organization. «Small is beautiful», declare the protesters as they seek to reestablish communal and craft environments characteristic of the preindustrial period. Parallel with this is a movement to promote “alternative” and “intermediate” technology, which aims to design tools that restore to the human worker the potential to use and express skill and creativity.

At the political level, too, there is reaction against large scale and centralization. In many industrial societies, such as those of Britain, France, and Canada, there have been strong regional movements demanding autonomy or outright independence. Often these are areas, such as Scotland in Britain, where at least substantial minorities wish to restore historic nations that have been incorporated into larger, more centralized states. Such movements derive momentum from the internationalization of the world economy and polity, which, over the world generally, gives rise to wholly new nationalisms as well. Lacking economic and often genuine political self-government, small societies assert their cultural identity and clamour and sometimes fight for autonomy. This was particularly evident in the 1990s with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the breakup of Yugoslavia, and other nationalist movements in Africa and throughout the

world. In less extreme cases, new nations may emerge, although their main symbols of independence may be no more than a national anthem and an international airport.

The assertion of cultural values opposed to modernity is a general characteristic of late industrialism. This may take the form of a revival of ethnicity, a claim for a culture and way of life that often harks back to older communal traditions and which denies the legitimacy of any uniform culture propagated by the large nation-state. Thus in the United States blacks, Hispanics, American Indians, and many other groups have made strong claims on behalf of a distinctive ethnic way of life that they variously seek to defend against the encroachments of the national culture. Protests against rationality and uniformity are seen, as well, in the successive waves of youth cultures and religious revivals that have marked late industrial society. Objectively, it is clear that the large-scale bureaucratic institutions of society continue to give the main direction to national life. All revolts break against their indispensability to modern society. But subjectively these institutions are incapable of satisfying the emotional and social needs of individuals. The consequence is the repeated rise of subcultures, often of bizarre mystical or hedonistic kinds, which aim in their practice to reverse the main features of modernity and which give their members a sense of participation and belonging of an almost tribal nature. Central to most of these antinomian movements and ideologies is a wholesale rejection of the scientific worldview, which is depicted as alienating and dehumanizing.

A nation that modernizes is set upon a path of development that carries its own logic and an inseparable mixture of good and bad. Without question, modern society brings progress in the form of material abundance. Less certainly, it brings increasing control of the natural and social environment. But its scientific and technological achievements are bought at some cost to spiritual and emotional life. In unifying the world, modernization establishes uniform standards, albeit higher ones in many cases than previously prevailed. At the same time, it ensures that failures and disasters will also be magnified globally. There are no retreats and escape routes, except those that modern society itself invents as pastimes. The world becomes one and its fate that of all its inhabitants.

To measure the balance of gains and losses in modernity and to increase the former against the latter require forms of social accounting and social engineering that have so far largely defied the efforts of social science and government. But in practice this does not matter. No one can wait for that problem to be solved, if it ever can be. To modernize is to take everything, the bad with the good, and not to modernize is to play no part in the life of contemporary humanity. One of the unusual, and historically

unprecedented, aspects of modernization is that it leaves no choice in the matter.

LIST OF SOURCES USED

1. Келле В.Ж. Процессы глобализации и динамики культуры / В.Ж. Келле. // Глобализация. – 2005.– №1. – С.69–70
2. Буданов В.Г. Синергетические механизмы роста научного знания и культура. / В.Г. Буданов. – М. : МИР. – 264 с.
3. Definitions and discussions of culture // Women, Culture, and Power. – 20012. – № 6. – P. 36-42
4. Stehr N. Knowledge Societies. / N. Stehr. – Thousand : Oaks, 2010. – 380 p.