

Certain aspects of the modernization process in Japan

B.K. Akyn

Kazakh National University named after al-Farabi, Almaty, Kazakhstan

E-mail: baggiv@rambler.ru

Annotation. This paper is devoted to study some features of the modernization process in Japan, including analyze the East Asian model in the context of the general theory of modernization. The author also said that the Japanese model of modernization in the mid-19th century to the present has become the object of comparative analysis. In addition, they were researched the theoretical issues of modernization.

Nowadays, the issue of East Asian way of modernization - the modernization, which is not only equal to Western, but also surpasses it, and will determine the forthcoming century, is the subject of wide speculations. However, it is worth mentioning that we do not try to reveal independent Asian way in the rationalism of Max Weber.

S. Huntington [1, p. 34] believes that combination of economic success and Asian culture creates specific form of democracy, which recognizes competition, but not the change of power, since the consensus and stability are much more important than values of competition and changes. In this vein, Japan was the pioneer. However, in these latter days, Japan also faced changes in power. Asian social scientists think that bureaucratic-authoritarian state, which disciplines workers and capitalists at the stage of economic growth, cannot restrain political claims of the middle class and dissemination of "civil society" [2, p. 17]. Therefore, they concede managing function of the bureaucratic authoritarianism during the growth phase, for example in China, but in perspective, think that aspiration to political participation is uncontained.

Leaders of Japan, Malaysia and Singapore interpose objections against model of western modernization, supporting Asian way of discipline and integration. The Prime Minister of Singapore before 1990, Mr. Li Kuan U has especially emphasized this point of view. Today this position is strongly supported by the Prime Minister of Malaysia Mahathir Mohammad. He makes a stand against claims of West for superiority of western hedonism and individualism: "Countries that achieve success today are not exactly liberal democracies with the governments that play central role in their economy" [3, p. 84].

After the end of the cold war, we rather see different ways of development towards similar purposes, then principally alternative purposes of completely different projects of future. In this situation the theory of modernization, which used to be considered practically useless in the end of seventies of the last century, undergoes revaluation and further development as ideology of late capitalism.

If the subject area of modernization is expressed in the following items: a) origination of modernized societies; b) the process, wherein those stayed behind overtake those that outrun; and c) innovation of modernized societies, then the theory of modernization shall be considered as applied theory at the abstraction level from "countries and dates", which does not compete with the basic paradigms of social sciences and is not identical to any separate of such paradigms (for example, structural functionalism, the theory of evolution). Combination of approaches, connected with actors, institutional and system approaches, integration and conflicts, are rather admissible as well as combinations of Elite theory's elements, innovations, classes and analysis of social structures.

E. Tiriakyan has developed a program of "modernization" or "neomodernization", wherein innovation powers of social movements and necessities of global processes are included into classical concepts of endogenous national-state development, subject to assessment by welfare of wider population [4, p. 165].

It is known that fundamental anthropological optimism is attributable to both classical and new approaches of the modernization theory, which reflects approaches or world perceptions, with which such theory is incompatible. In this respect, S. Huntington draws an alternative paradigm of irrepressible

conflict of cultures (“a clash of civilizations”) [5, p. 49]. Literature, which assesses destruction of ecology higher than advantages of the whole modernization, is incompatible with modernization-theoretical interpretation as well as literature, which positions victims of wars, violence, underdevelopment and marginalization higher than advantages of integration and growth in prosperity owing to modernization.

Those, who understand globalization (of capital, information) as a mega-trend, undermining abilities of national states to act by virtue of difference between civilizations, will negate diagnosis of modernization theory and the fact that in the XXI century, national states will dominate as actors, while supranational mergers will rather consolidate them, than weaken [6, p. 63-78]. G. Therborn adduces sharp arguments against globalization thesis and leveling theory of modernization, differentiating four “doors” or “ways into/through modernization”: revolutions and reforms in Europe, new world of America and Oceania; externally imposed modernizations (Japan, Egypt); openness enforced by colonialism [7, p. 139].

After brief review of the new literature, we raise final question: how different the present creative theoretical competition could be, if the theory of modernization, due to its named and unnamed defects was absent. Such mental experiment is conducted by authors, ignoring theory of modernization. For example, D. Zenghaas describes situation in China in the following way:

“Social pluralism will further gather dynamism owing to irreversible processes of economic transformation. There will be more sociability, and politically articulated culture may be formed in the following sequence: the party-monopolist without law-governed state and democracy, plural party with the rudiments of the law-governed state and democracy... enlargement of pluralization and formation of germinal signs of democratic constitutional state; all that within 15 – 25 years [8, p.78].

In the beginning of the present article, we have considered special way of modernization of oriental nations. Now we would like to analyze separate peculiarities of Japanese modernization process in details.

Changes that took place in Japan during last one hundred odd years are so impetuous and impressing both in whole and in details, so it is hardly believed that books written about it in the end of the XIX century by European scientists, travelers and diplomats refer to that country. The country experiences deep transformation processes in all spheres of the society's life, reflecting objective historical tendencies of

modernization and internationalization of economy, politics, science and culture, which brings nations of different countries together and promote their cooperation and mutual understanding. These processes are conditioned with the set of endogenous and external factors.

In this connection it is worth mentioning pronouncements of V.I. Lenin, ideally suitable for the present situation: “Developing capitalism knows two historical tendencies... First: the awakening of national life and national movements; Second: development and intensification of all kinds of intercourse between nations, breakdown of national barriers, creation of the international unity of capital, of economic life in general, of politics, science, etc [9, p. 124].

New image of Japan, which organically combines traditional elements and western innovations, has been formed in course of the mentioned changes. The period under review may be clearly divided into two phases, which, in turn, aligned with the two breaking points of the national history. First phase is the Meiji Restoration (Meiji Ishin), when active contacts with western countries had begun after more than two hundred years of isolation. This period was also marked with the beginning of the large-scale modernization, taking the shape of westernization or rather Europeanization and Americanization after the World War II. This is the specificity of Japan, as an Asian country. However, even those days Japan contributed into the development of western civilization, particularly in the field of culture. Thus, the mentioned process can be described as the first steps towards internationalization.

The second phase begins with the surrender of country in 1945. Since then, Japan demonstrates unusually successful and sustained stable development, steadily strengthening its economic, political and cultural positions on the world stage for more than fifty years. It is noteworthy that during first two postwar decades Japan has continued to borrow from western nations, then thereafter we can observe the process of generous and ever-increasing scale return of its achievements mainly in technical and economical field. This historical phenomenon of Japan's record period of economic growth following World War II is called “Japanese economic miracle”. Although this miracle is not the point of issue any longer, the Japanese phenomenon continues to draw attention of people. After all the country demonstrates high level of adaptation to changes of the development conditions, giving fine example for a number of developed and developing countries.

Reorganization capabilities of Japanese society throughout its history allow us understanding the process of modernization. This intensive process has drawn out the so-called theory of modernization in Japan in the end of fifties of the XX century. However, successes of Japan that brought it into line with western countries, force us return to this theme and put emphasis on the Japanese style of modernization.

Interest to these issues in the context of formational and civilizational approaches consistently draws attention of local researchers. Analysis of any society's development processes, without any doubts, cannot be limited with consideration of such promising parameters, as "method of manufacture" and "classes". The subject matter is the specific actions of people, their relationships within the family, community, enterprise, i.e. inside small groups. In the other words, comprehensive estimation of any society is possible based on the examination of socio-economic, socio-psychological, ideological and cultural aspects of its life.

Under this understanding of the society's life analysis, formational approach, which primarily operates with productive forces and industrial relations, looks slightly limited. Although it has provided an opportunity for the system history study, this approach insufficiently considers human with its living and spiritual life, religion, science, psychology and mentality, due to the use of basic concepts. Therefore, application of the civilizational approach for studying of the society is more expedient, as it is focused on human with his abilities of self-expression and self-development.

As far as the term civilization is often used for identification of any certain period in the development of one or another society or in a global scale, then in this sense, as noted professor I.M. Osadchaya, civilization and formation are homogeneous concepts. It is explained with the fact that both concepts includes material and industrial center, economic, political, legal, cultural, religious and other forms of human interaction, typical for one or another period in the society's history [10, p. 6]. However, the fact of the matter is to what the priority is given. If the formation approach chairs economy, the civilizational approach places priority on the human and his values, while economic achievements are considered from the perspective of their usefulness to all members of the society. Indeed, the concept of civilization is close to the concept of culture, as both of them are determined by the relations of people in the society, in the whole variety. In general, civilizational approach covers more powerful, broad and long-term processes than formational.

In the contemporary context of intensification of economic, political and cultural ties between nations, strengthening of interdependence and interconnection of local societies, civilizational process becomes truly global, and according to the professor G.G. Digilenskii, may result in creation of planetary civilization, which in turn does not mean simple mechanical connection of local civilizations [11, p. 30].

Modernization is the continuous process, but the term has relatively short history. It has several interpretations in contemporary sociological literature. Most scientists identify modernization with entering on the path of capitalist development by the countries. Among this pleiad of eminent scientists, it is worth mentioning one of the authors of Japanese theory of modernization - the famous American researcher of Japan E. Reischauer (Harvard University). According to him, the process of modernization could last from hundreds of years to a few decades, always associating with fundamental changes. Putting emphasis on the crucial nature of such changes, E. Reischauer compares their significance with the "transition from households based on hunting and gathering to agriculture, or from the use of stone artifacts to bronze and iron ones" [11, p. 16].

A number of scientists suggest considering modernization of one or another country in comparison with the more developed country, such as Japan and Britain, or with the "ideal type", as defined by one of the leading sociologists of the XX century Max Weber. More often than not, and to some truly extent, modernization stands for conversion of any traditional "oriental" society into "western", which is considered to be more civilized. First, this implies that western society possesses such universal values as separation of powers, personal freedom and other human rights, freedom of enterprise, political sovereignty, the right of nations to self-determination and freedom of social choice. All developing countries are seeking for such kind of society; and it is very important for the CIS countries.

In this regard, it is worth mentioning the importance of the society's economic life for the fate of civilizations that is according to Max Weber represents rational method of economic management and rational capitalistic organization of free (formal) labor. Western countries are the most outstanding example of such societies, as such cultural phenomena, which have been developed in the direction of universal value, were created exactly in western countries [12, p. 44].

Whereas, original spiritual values have played

and still playing an important role in oriental societies, Max Weber introduces the concept of rationalism, which means combination of historical factors, which have determined development of European societies over the past few centuries, for describing historical process in western countries. It is worth mentioning that the society, which is now known as industrial or industrially developed, has appeared exactly Europe for the first time ever in human history. All other types of societies Max Weber refers to traditional ones.

Thus, it turns out that rationalization is the historical process, being identical to modernization in its essence. Although Max Weber does not use the term “modernization” directly, modern historians study this problem using his classical heritage. In particular, Benjamin Schwartz – one of the researches of that problem wrote - “If we follow Weber, then, in my opinion, there is the only possibility to outline the borders of modernization concept: it includes systematic, long-term and purposeful application of human energy to the “rational” control over material and social environment of the human for realization of different values. I have used adjectives purposeful, systematic and long-term, as it is clear that the rationalization process itself began long before the discovery of the Modern Age term. Rationalization process existed throughout the history of humankind [12, p. 23].

Until recently, most foreign scientists used to link modernization with formational development of the society, thus, denying civilizational approach as a

whole. The pattern of Japanese civilization serves as a practical confirmation of it.

References

1. Huntington S. Democracy's third wave // Journal of democracy. – 1991.
2. Han, Sang-Jin. Economic development and democracy: Korea as a new model? // Korea Journal. – 1995. – Summer.
3. Mohamad Mahatir, Shihara Shintaro. The voice of Asia. – Tokyo, 1995.
4. Tiriakyan E. Modernization: exhumetur in pace (rethinking macrosociology in the 1990s) // International Sociology. – 1991. – V. 6. – № 2.
5. Huntington S. The clash of civilizations? // Foreign Affairs. – 1993. – Summer.
6. Giddens A. The consequences of modernity. Stanford. Ca. –1990.
7. Therborn G. Routes to/through modernity / Global modernities. Eds. M. Featherstone et al. L. – 1995.
8. Senghaas D. Wie geht es mit China weiter? // Leviathan. 1996. Heft 1. S. 78ff.
9. Ленин В.И. Полное собрание сочинений, т. 24 (Критические заметки по национальному вопросу).
10. Мировая экономика и международные отношения. – 1991, – № 5.
11. Вопросы философии. – 1991, – № 3.
12. Вебер М. Избранные произведения. – М., 1990.

Б.К. Акын

Жапониядағы жаңғыру үдерісінің кейбір аспектілері

Бұл мақала Жапониядағы жаңғыру үдерісінің кейбір ерекшеліктерін зерттеуге, оның ішінде жалпы жаңғыру теориясы аясында шығысаязиялық модельді талдауға арналған. Автор XIX ғасырдың ортасынан бастап қазіргі кезеңге дейінгі жапон жаңғыру үлгісін көптеген салыстырмалы талдаудың нысанына айналғанын да айқындай түсті. Сонымен бірге жаңғырудың теориялық мәселелерінің кейбір аспектілері қарастырылды.

Б.К. Акын

Некоторые аспекты модернизационного процесса в Японии

Настоящая статья посвящена изучению некоторых особенностей процесса модернизации в Японии, в том числе анализу восточноазиатской модели в контексте общей теории модернизации. Автор статьи также уточнил, что модель японской модернизации с середины XIX века по настоящее время превратилась в объект сравнительного анализа. Кроме того, были рассмотрены теоретические вопросы модернизации.