

RSC, Number 5, Issue 1, January 2013, pp. 65-93.

Modernization and Pseudomorphosis: The Case of the Forced Gender Transformation in the Context of the Communist Project of Modernization and its Collapse

Yuriy Savelyev

National Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv

yursave@yahoo.com

Abstract: An impact of the global process of modernization on gender relations in post-communist countries is analyzed in the paper. It is argued that a unique gender order of the 1990s in several post-communist countries was a result of an artificial and perverted form of gender transformation which was implemented within the communist project of modernization. While a profound change of gender order was accelerated by means of implementation of collective rights, gender transformation and institutional emancipation as its attractor could be true, profound and irreversible only if they were a legitimate result of societal and cultural evolution. Otherwise, they are a sociocultural pseudomorphosis which completely depends on an implemented project of modernization. If this project is over, as in the case of post-soviet countries, probable demodernization inevitably leads to masculine backlash in culture and social institutions and subsequent decrease of social inclusion of women. Therefore, the critical question in the global process of gender transformation in non-western cultures is whether the project of modernization which is implemented in a given society is viable.

Keywords: modernization, gender order, social transformation, post-communism, globalization, social inclusion, Eastern Europe

Introduction

Having become a global process, gender transformation as a crucial feature of modernity has been confronting a multicultural challenge. Globalization (in Roland Robertson's words) "both promotes and is conditioned by cultural homogeneity and cultural heterogeneity" (Robertson 1992, 173). If innovative gender transformation has been inspired by Western (Northern-Atlantic) civilization and is spontaneous in terms of its culture and societal evolution, for societies with "catching-up development" it is conflated with a certain project of sometimes forced modernization.

Modernization is a continuing and global process (Bauman: 2000; Martinelli: 2005). Although modernization of "catching-up" societies is not possible without changes in gender relationships, emancipation of women and their inclusion in various social activities can irritate traditional patriarchic society. It may happen even if alterations in gender roles and especially in women's behavior are not connected with true emancipation and equality. It is well-known that globalization can provoke a negative strong reaction by local communities and actually is a conflicting two-edged process of "glocalization" (Robertson 1992; Bauman 1998). Therefore, issues of gender transformation in the context of globalization, institutional and cultural diversity should not be ignored.

Among social theorists there has been extensive discussion on universality of modernization and validity of multiple modernities (Eisenstadt 2000; Wittrock 2000; Chirot 2001; Therborn 2003; Martinelli 2005; Schmidt 2006; 2010; Wagner 2011). Based on ample empirical evidences from longitudinal cross-cultural study of values R.Inglehart and C.Welzel (2009; 2010) argue that modernization has proved to be universal. According to them economic development leads to a shift in values that in turn determines rise of democratic institutions. Consequently, a rise of secular and emancipative or self-expression values should lead to acceptance and acceleration of gender transformation and greater social inclusion of women. On the contrary, “multiple modernities” theorists contend that there are different cultural interpretations or trajectories of modernity (Eisenstadt 2010; Wagner 2010). For instance, research on Russia demonstrates a number of peculiarities in values and attitudes towards state, private businesses, individual autonomy, freedom, etc. that had not changed along with economic development and growing prosperity or created unique combinations which are far from western patterns (Tikhonova 2011). This allows V.Yadov to assume an existence of “national peculiarities of modernization of Russian society” and the reality of “a special development track of Russia” (Yadov 2010: 52). However, such an approach also implies that gender transformation may follow various ways and may not enhance social inclusion of women.

Reflecting these issues, multicultural and global feminisms have become significant frameworks of feminist theory (Shohat 2001; Ferree & Tripp 2006; Pearson 2007). Although multicultural feminism criticizes “female essentialism” according to which “the idea of “woman” exists as

some sort of Platonic form each and every flesh-and-blood woman somehow fits” notwithstanding her race, culture and class (Tong 1998: 212), it focuses on differences only between women but not cultures. Multicultural feminism is aware of problems and interests of women who belong to various race, ethnic and social groups, studies cultural peculiarities and devices of oppression and males dominance over women but mostly, as well as global feminism, is concerned with women’s communication, mutual understanding and creation of “multicultural-and-global-feminist sisterhood” (Tong 1998; Ferree & Tripp 2006; Pearson 2007). Both frameworks are not able to explain contradictions of the global process of gender transformation, and, in particular, indicate societal and cultural patterns that have caused recent and unique gender order in post-communist countries which combines communist heritage, contemporary social problems of society in transition, and revitalization of tradition with pre-modern elements.

A detailed study of the post-communist gender order allows grasping unknown before social and cultural phenomena such as “masculine democracy” (Watson 1997; Wejnert et al. 1996), which contradicts the logic of global gender transformation and liberal values of modern society. In the context of societal transition from totalitarian regimes to political democracy and market economy in Eastern Europe during 1990’s processes of deepened economic inequality between men and women, women’s political marginalization, reconstruction of traditional gendered consciousness and reinvention of gendered mythologies were not at all expected. Therefore, it is important to reveal

surprising backlash forces that induced deviation from the global pattern of gender transformation.

Based on experience of the Communist Project of modernization and its consequences for post-soviet countries I argue that gender transformation cannot be imposed. Successful at the first glance worldwide activity of United Nations and different international women organization especially after United Nations Conference on Women in Beijing 1995, which accelerates gender transformation of non-western cultures through legal and political means including Affirmative Action, creates illusion of such possibility. United Nations Millennium Development Goal to promote gender equality and empower women is rested on the assumption about universality of gender transformation and its institutional means (UN 2000). The ultimate result of such efforts is supposed to be a boost in social inclusion of women within more inclusive societies with wider opportunities (Dani & de Haan 2008; Atkinson & Marlier 2010). The same policy is officially supported and implemented by the European Union including countries of Central and Eastern Europe (Ballington & Binda 2005; Marlier et al. 2007).

However, if gender transformation is an artificial borrowing since external influence, social institutions and culture of patriarchic society are capable to generate sociocultural forms of protection which eliminate apparent gains of women emancipation. Moreover, self-protection can be preventive with the purpose to preclude changes which associated with Western civilization. Islamic fundamentalism (as well as any other form of religious or ethnic fundamentalism) definitely

plays the role of such a kind of protection and its consequences can be very dangerous.

Admittedly, gender relations are not located in isolated specifically “gendered” social institutions, but constitute “the state of play” or “gender regimes” in all types of institutions (Connell 1987: 120). The aggregation of institutionalized gender micro- and meso-practices corresponds to current macro-politics of a particular gender order, which, following J. Matthews and R.W. Connell, is “a historically constructed pattern of power relations between men and women and definitions of femininity and masculinity” and essentially indicates “the structural inventory of an entire society” (Connell 1987: 98-99).

Social development consequently induces structural transformations. In this paper sociocultural gender transformation is understood to be a crucial shift of the complex of gender relations in a given society. This concept ought not to be confused with the term which is used to indicate transformation surgery for transsexuals. The latter semantically is not perfect, for it deals with transformation surgery of biological sex but not gender. The concept “gender transformation” with sociocultural meaning as a change of “system of gender relations” (Walby 1997: 1) is mainly used in the countries of “new democracy” – South Africa, Eastern-European and post-soviet states, where gender transformation is considered to be an integral part of democratic transformation and

primarily identified with political system changes and women access to power (Wejnert et al. 1996: 3-17).

However, gender transformation embraces a wide circle of social and cultural phenomena on different levels. First, cultural level, gender transformation is a critical change of roles, significances and semiotics of femininity and masculinity in the sociocultural system. Second, institutional level, gender transformation refers to the loss or gain of feminine or masculine features of social institutions, which may be inclusive or exclusive, and ensuing institutionalized practices. Third, personal and interpersonal level, gender transformation leads to alteration of females' and males' achieved social statuses, level of social inclusion, gender roles, frames, competences and patterns of behavior and interaction. Overall, gender transformation means a substitution of a particular gender order.

Gender transformation has a great impact on everyday life of modern society and will have even more in the future. Its significance can be explained by lasting consistency of gender relationships in human culture through thousands of years. A certain social gender order emerged in Neolithic epoch, and whereby civilizations grew up and crashed down, new classes and strata appeared and disappeared again, cultures mixed up gender order persisted. Only Western civilization was capable to produce sociocultural mutation which in its importance was similar to emergence of capitalism and industrial revolution and broke gendered status quo. Furthermore, this innovative process has been embracing many other cultures and has become global. The change of women's position in society

with subsequent transformations of family, labor market, education etc. were important signs of modernization. Gender transformation is inevitable attribute of modernity and an integral part of globalization. Consequently, it is also conflated with westernization and alien influence on local cultures (Walby 1997: 195); although gender transformation is an internal necessity, prerequisite and outcome for those societies which are on the way of modernization.

A pivotal gender transformation of the last century has been accelerated by the process of emancipation and the feminist movement. The purpose of true emancipation is not a simple change of women's position in society and achievement of social equality between men and women, but a profound and irreversible shift of significance of femininity in comparison with masculinity in the sociocultural system. Therefore, the purpose and outcome of emancipation is gender transformation, which includes changes of masculinity as well as femininity and induce greater social inclusion of women with a subsequent rise of opportunities.

These changes have been accomplishing gradually. The history of emancipation in the Northern-Atlantic civilization during the last 150 years in terms of gender transformation may be divided into five stages: first, legal and political emancipation, second, educational, third, economic, fourth, physiological, and fifth, institutional emancipation. The first stage gave women legal rights and allowed them to participate in social life. The second one destroyed gender barriers on the way of intellectual and cultural human development. Women are even more educated now than men in many developed western countries (Basu 1995). Economic

emancipation became possible in developed western countries due to huge economic growth and increasing level of quality of life during second half of the twentieth century. In spite of the wage gap between men and women in these countries and especially in the USA, the main outcome of the economic stage of emancipation is financial independence of the vast majority of women who can live and raise children regardless men's support. Women have also gained independence in the crucial point whether to have or not children. This is the result of physiological emancipation which has been based on medical science inventions but has been inspired by social, legal, economical and cultural accomplishments of the previous stages of emancipation without which these inventions would have never been used. It has been giving women an opportunity to focus on professional carrier and master new scopes of activity. Besides the birth control now medicine provides artificial insemination that may create possibility of excluding of men from family life and raising children in the future.

However, women couldn't use all of these advantages because of the dominance of subculture of masculinity in sociocultural system. This dominance was institutionalized, and women were helpless compared to societal institutions which were formed in patriarchic society, consolidated strategy of male behavior and masculine semiotic. The early stages of emancipation and the feminist movement were devoted to a struggle for masculinity which was considered to be a general base and a scale of equality of men and women. Masculinity used to be and in majority societies still is a universal and supreme value of culture since it was dominant in patriarchic society.

It is necessary to emphasize that it has never been a domination of a biological sex. According to Sandra Bem (Bem 2003: 149-153) it is important to distinguish biological male and female and real male and female. The latter are the result of cultural transformation of the former into masculine and feminine. She points out that a definition of real men is thoroughly intertwined with being powerful and privileged. David Gilmore's research (Gilmore 2001: 882-901) shows that masculine identity and status always have been desirable and achieved in contrast to feminine identity and status, which always have been considered to be natural and ascribed. In contrast to Bem, who claims that in androcentric culture definition of a real woman is not easy to attain, Gilmore argues that femininity is given by nature and can be only culturally refined or promoted. At the same time masculinity is a desirable cultural value to gain and is an object of social competition.

Therefore, an explanation of the consistent dominance of masculinity in society is that masculinity was and still is more culturally and socially significant than femininity. In its turn, this dominance leads to preserving of higher significance of masculinity. Masculinity was institutionalized as a monopoly of social and cultural activity which has been allowing its bearers to attain decisive positions in society and prestigious statuses. Consequently, femininity was not socially significant since it could not provide access to cultural values and high social statuses. Women as the bearers of femininity couldn't be social actors. It created a myth about natural feminine passivity. On the contrary, "naturally" many women were very active. But they were doomed to be passive in terms of their feminine culture which had been formed historically. That is why

women always have joined in the implicit fight for masculinity, and they started to aspire to masculine roles openly since emancipation had begun. They adopted men's hairstyles, elements of menswear, patterns of behavior, did men's job etc.

However, the struggle for masculinity didn't change women's position in society principally because sociocultural significance of femininity didn't increase. Now "catching-up with men" strategy and "a policy of equalization" are criticized in feminist thought (Mies & Shiva 1993: 8, 64-68). All previous stages of emancipation only prepared the ground for the true emancipation which is capable to give femininity an opportunity to compete successfully with masculine subculture. This is institutional emancipation whose primarily goal is to gain a control under still essentially patriarchic social institutions which grant inclusion into important realms of social life. The consequence of such control will be an increasing value of femininity in society. It means profound gender transformation since femininity won't be primarily identified with biological hallmarks such as fertility and physical attractiveness. Women will receive opportunity for personal fulfillment not only in family and motherhood but in all shears of social activity without accepting masculine roles and being condemned to be masculine. If femininity can provide the same social success as masculinity, femininity will attain the same sociocultural significance and masculinity will lose monopoly for social activity. It wouldn't mean equality as it used to be considered. The subsistence of femininity and masculinity will be still different. And eventually it will transform dichotomy of hierarchical structures which has been criticized by feminist thinkers (Mies & Shiva 1993: 5).

The main obstacle on this way is social institutions. Even if women have equal rights, they can't gain essential representation in male controlled institutions because of "glass ceiling", "old boy system", "old gentlemen club" etc. The only effective device of demasculinization of social institutions is implementation of collective (or group) rights. If initially feminist movement fought for equal rights, then now priority has been given to collective rights. It is important to point out that the latter don't break the principle of justice since, as it is well known in the contemporary Philosophy of Law, collective rights help race and ethnic minority groups protect their interests and compensate historic unfairness toward them (Kymlicka 1995; 1998). This approach can be also applied to women majority because women as well as ethnic and race minorities were unfairly and groundlessly deprived of opportunities which were allotted for men.

The simplest and most efficient way of the accomplishment of collective rights is Affirmative Action (Sowell 2004; Affirmative Action 2009). Admittedly, implementation of required quota of women's representation in political and governmental structures was launched in Scandinavian countries during 70's. The law of gender equality was adopted in Island in 1976, in Denmark in 1978, in Norway in 1979, in Sweden in 1980, in Finland in 1987. Informal quotas adopted by political parties became even more important. They have ensured 40-50% representation in parliaments of Scandinavian countries. Labor party in Great Britain tried this approach during elections in 1997. France adopted the legislation which guarantees parity (50/50) representation in 2000. Furthermore, this process of institutional emancipation has become global.

The quota method was approved by Organization of United Nations in 1979 and 2000 and at the United Nations Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995. A system of quotas is implemented now in many countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa as well as in Central and Eastern Europe (Andersen and Siim 2004; Dani & de Haan 2008; Ballington & Binda 2005).

At the same time we can observe specific cultural features and unevenness of this process in different countries. Taking into consideration experience of the Soviet Union and post-soviet states, it is necessary to emphasize that, first, successful institutional emancipation is not possible without completion of all previous stages; second, economic crisis and demodernization are a threat to institutional gains of women and to their social inclusion.

In contrast to western countries, in the post-soviet states and in Ukraine in particular, the economic stage of emancipation hasn't finished, and there are no signs of institutional emancipation can be detected. Conversely, quotas of women's representation in legislatures, which were informally adopted in the Soviet Union, don't exist anymore. It has led to a catastrophic decline of women's representation in political life.

After the Bolshevik revolution women in Russia and Ukraine received the most progressive in that time in the world law about equality between men and women. That also meant women involvement in political life, wage labor, increasing level of education etc. Women in the Soviet Union had the same stages of emancipation as in Western Europe and Northern America with only but sufficient difference: if in the West it was a result of spontaneous process of social and cultural development of

Western society and achievements of the women's movement, then in the Soviet Union emancipation was implemented by the ruling Communist Party and the government for ideological, economic and political reasons.

This policy was called "state feminism" (Ajvazova 1998). One of the parts and result of this policy was implementation of informal quotas of women representation in governmental and public institutions. Thus, institutional emancipation due to the Communist Project of modernization began in the USSR 50-60 years earlier than in the fore of gender transformation of western society – in Scandinavian countries! Certainly, it was not real and all-compassing institutional emancipation. Crucial societal institutions in the Soviet Union remained masculine. In terms of Oswald Spengler's theory of culture it can be defined as pseudomorphosis which means sociocultural development of a given society through borrowed and hence artificial and perverted cultural forms (Spengler 1991 [1923]: 26). Modernization always has a threat of pseudomorphosis. However, the uniqueness of this situation is that pseudomorphosis as a policy of "state feminism" preceded the authentic sociocultural pattern – true institutional emancipation in Western countries.

Although gender transformation as a policy of "state feminism" was forced outcome caused by necessities of modernization, overall it was positive for women and gave them principally new opportunities of personal fulfillment. First, they became a significant and then a critical part of Labor Force. If in 1926 women were 23% of total workforce, then in 1940 – 39%, in 1960 – 47% and since 1970 through 1990 – 51% (Ajvazova 1998: 136). Only during World War II the percentage of women in Labor

Force was higher – 56% due to a dearth of labourers. Thus, women in the Soviet Union were the capital part of workforce and 51% was even higher than it is in western countries in 90's: 39% in Germany, 40% in France, 45% in Sweden, 41% in the USA (Basu 1995: 406-409, 436).

The vast majority of women in the Soviet Union were involved in professional development: 92% of women, which were capable of working, were full or part time workers or studied (Ajvazova 1998: 136). As a result, Soviet women became more educated than men in 1970-80's: they were 59% of people who had tertiary education; 66% physicians, 74% teachers, 60% engineers and 87% economists (Ajvazova 1998: 137). These figures are higher in comparison with Western countries at that time and even now.

Women were incorporated in the Soviet legislatures and had consistently increasing quotas of representation. They were 33.1% of members of local legislatures in 1939, 45.8% in 1971 and 50% in 1987 as well as 26% of members of the Supreme Council – the Soviet Union Parliament in 1952, 31% in 1970 and 33% in 1984 (Ajvazova 1998:145).

After the Soviet Union collapsed, the situation changed dramatically. In spite of activity of feminist organizations, women don't have significant political influence. There were only 13.5% women members of the State Duma and 5% of the Council of Federation elected in 1993 and 10.5% and 0.5% of the same chambers elected in 1995 in Russia (Kochkina 1999: 117). Women also are only 9% of members of local legislations. Overall representation of women in governmental institution

and legislations of different levels in the Russian Federation was 5.6% in 2001.

There is the same trend in Ukraine (Vlasenko 2001: 3-5) where indexes of representation were even worse in the middle of 90's. There were only 19 women (4.2%) members of Verhovna Rada (the parliament of Ukraine) elected in 1994. The situation improved slightly in 1998 when 37 women were elected to the Ukrainian parliament. But it was still only 8.2% that was less than in the Russian Lower Chamber. Moreover, a number of women in the Ukrainian parliament declined again to 5.1% after election in 2002 (UNDP 2003b: 32).

Economic reforms in 1990's and new market economy definitely were not favourable for women. Russian and Ukrainian women are not a big and important part of workforce any more. If they were 51% of workforce in 1990, then there were 47% women in Russian economy in 1997, and during 7 years a number of women in workforce decreased for 7.4 million (Ajvazova 1998). The level of women's employment in Ukraine decreased only in 4 years for 9.3% (60% in 1995 and 50.7% in 1999) and is 8.9% lower than men's level of employment (Vlasenko 2001:15). Women are 48.7% of workforce in Ukraine in 2000's (Alekseev 2003: 31).

Although it doesn't seem as a significant difference in comparison with 51% of Soviet times, the change is indicative. Moreover, there are definite new qualitative differences in the structure of labor force which is a decisive factor for women's economic opportunities. Women have been pushed from spheres of professional activity which are more dynamic and better paid. The vast majority of women work in spheres of education,

culture, health and social care in which 72-83% of employees are women and the salary rate is the lowest in wage labor; at the same time 65-73% of workforce in spheres with the highest wage comprised of men (Vlasenko 2001: 25; Alekseev 2003: 31). Gender differences within industries are even more demonstrative. Working in spheres with the highest wage does not guarantee that women can approach men's income – Ukrainian women earned 57.2% of men's wage within the same industry in 1999 and 53.4% in 2002 (Vlasenko 2001: 25; Makara 2003:19). In the industry with the lowest wage, in which 81.2% employees are comprised of women, they earned 64.8% of men's wage in 1999 (Vlasenko 2001: 25). Consequently, the wage gape has been growing: women earned 80.1% in 1995, 72.4% in 1999 and 69.3% in 2002 of men's income (Vlasenko 2001: 25; UNDP 2003a: 28).

Thus, women in Russia and Ukraine have been losing the gains of the policy of state feminism implemented in the Soviet Union. They only kept the higher level of education which, however, could be explained by rather low level of prestige of education which did not influence much on income and social status. Overall, since the Soviet Union collapsed, the level of masculinity of society, ethnic cultures and especially economic institutions of the former Soviet Republics dramatically increased during 1990's. Level of social inclusion of women dropped. Public opinion became more conservative and patriarchic stereotypes reappeared. Women were accounted socially inactive and focused on family life. Ancient sacral functions were ascribed to a Women who bears an important mission which is given to Her by Nature. Women were expected to personify beauty, femininity and tenderness and bring peace and pleasure into

wicked men's world. A glaring example of post-communist masculine backlash is reinvention of mythological matriarchal image of Berehynia in contemporary Ukrainian society (Kis 2003). On the other hand, women's position in post-communist economy made living and raising children independently extremely difficult. Consequently, women were compelled to trade womanhood for men's social and financial support. Resultant post-communist gender order demanded from women to be dependent and seek for men's protection. This mode of behavior was acknowledged as normative.

The fundamental cause of the post-communist gender order and economic ground behind it was demodernization of many post-soviet countries. Gender transformation was an integral part of the Communist Project of modernization of the Soviet Union, and then when that project was over one could see, according to Stephen Cohen, "the unprecedented demodernization of a twentieth-century country" (Cohen 2001: 45).

In my previous research I showed sharp distinctions in development tracks of different clusters of post-communist countries in Eastern Europe some of which were associated with demodernization (Savelyev 2011). Measuring development via HDI (UNDP Human Development Index) one can see what a huge fall experienced by post-soviet countries in 1990's after the Communist Project of modernization collapsed. While Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia quickly recovered after 1995, Moldova, Ukraine, Belarus and Russian Federation had large slump and did not surpass by 2000 their level of development before start of transition period in 1990. Bulgaria and Romania had moderate decrease

from 1990 till 1995 and their HDI trends were very similar to the HDI trends of Russian Federation and Belarus from 1995 till 2000 (see Table 1).

In the situation of social and economic disintegration when society has been going “backward to a premodern era” (Cohen 2001:169), patriarchic features which were typical for premodern or “low-modern” sociocultural system emerged inevitably. That was the price for gender pseudomorphosis of the Communist Project of modernization which Russian, Ukrainian and some other societies should pay, and women of these societies had and still have to confront inexorable gender backlash.

Thus, institutional emancipation is a logical completion of the feminist movement of the last century and a pivotal phase of gender transformation. This stage of emancipation has resulted in a rise of significance and a new important role of femininity in contemporary western culture, and will be able to determine gender relationships in the future. However, institutional emancipation as a global process is equivocal. Although it has been embracing more and more countries, peculiarities of its implementation, results and complications are determined by different cultures that makes gender transformation inevitably multicultural.

As an example, the post-soviet countries, which used to follow the western way of gender transformation and even had started institutional emancipation through the policy of state feminism earlier than it happened in the West, now have reinforced masculine features of social institutions and demonstrate reversibility of gender transformation which was not a natural outcome of preceding sociocultural development. Demodernization

of some of these countries has led to unprecedented masculine backlash. The critical question in the global process of gender transformation of non-western cultures is whether a project of modernization, which is implemented in a given society, is viable. Therefore, a new turn in post-communist countries development, which may be defined as a remordenization, the project of which is based on liberal values and market economy and, as it seems, provides new opportunities and better prospects for women, nevertheless cannot guarantee for these countries a liberal gender order which exists in western societies – unless, gender transformation and institutional emancipation as its attractor are true and profound, for they are a consequent result of social and economic development. Otherwise, gender transformation is always a sociocultural pseudomorphosis which completely depends on an implemented project of modernization.

**Table 1. Human Development Index of Central
and Eastern European countries in 1990 - 2000**

Country	1990	1995	2000
Slovenia	0,851	0,857	0,891
Czech Republic	0,845	0,854	0,866
Hungary	0,813	0,817	0,845

Poland	0,806	0,822	0,852
Lithuania	0,827	0,791	0,831
Estonia	0,813	0,792	0,829
Latvia	0,804	0,771	0,817
Bulgaria	0,794	0,785	0,800
Romania	0,777	0,772	0,780
Belarus	0,790	0,755	0,778
Russian Federation	0,815	0,771	0,782
Ukraine	0,809	0,756	0,761
Moldova	0,740	0,684	0,683

Source: Human Development Report 2007/2008. New York: UNDP, 2007.

References

Affirmative Action (2009). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. First published December 28, 2001; substantive revision April 1, 2009. Available at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/affirmative-action/>

Ajvazova, S. (1998). Russkie zhenshchny v labirinte ravnopravia. [Russian women in labyrinth of equal rights]. Moskva: RDK Rusanova.

Alekseev, S. (2003). Gendernyi aspekt zanjatosti v Ukraini (kinets 20 - pochatok 21 st.) [Gender aspect of employment in Ukraine (at the end of 20 – beginning of 21 century)]. Gender: realii ta perspektyvy v ukrainskomu suspilstvi. Kyiv: PTS Foliant.

Andersen, J. & Siim B. (2004). The politics of inclusion and empowerment: gender, class, and citizenship. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Atkinson, A.B. & Marlier, E. (2010). Analysing and Measuring Social Inclusion in a Global Context. New York: United Nations.

Ballington, J. & Binda, F. (2005). The Implementation of Quotas: European Experiences. Edited by Julie Ballington and Francesca Binda. Stockholm: IDEA.

Basu, A. (1995). *The Challenge of Local Feminisms: Women's Movements in Global Perspective*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Bauman, Z. (1998). On Glocalization: or Globalization for some, Localization for some Others. *Thesis Eleven*, 54 (1), 37-49.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge, UK : Polity Press.

Bem, S. L. (1993). *The Lenses of Gender. Transforming the Debates on Sexual Inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Chiot, D. (2001) A Clash of Civilizations or of Paradigms? : Theorizing Progress and Social Change, *International Sociology*, Vol. 16 (3), 341–360.

Cohen, S. F. (2001). *Failed Crusade: America and the Tragedy of Post-Communist Russia*. New York: W.W.Norton & Co.

Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Dani, A. & de Haan, A. (2008). *Inclusive states: social policy and structural inequalities*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2010). *Modernity and Modernization*, *Sociopedia*. International Sociological Association, 1 - 15. Available at: <http://www.sociopedia.isa/>

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2000). *Multiple Modernities*, *Daedalus*, Vol. 129

(1), 1–29.

Ferree, M.M. & Tripp, A.M. (2006). *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights*. Edited by Myra Marx Ferree & Aili Mari Tripp. New York: New York University Press.

Gilmore, D. (2001). *Zagadka myzhestvennosti*. [Enigma of masculinity]. *Vvedenie v gendernye issledovania*. SPb, Kharkov: HTSGI Alteja.

Inglehart, R. & Welzel, C. (2010). *Changing Mass Priorities. The Link between Modernization and Democracy, Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 8 (2), 551–567.

Inglehart, R. & Welzel, C. (2009). *How Development Leads to Democracy: What We Know about Modernization Today*, *Foreign Affairs*, 8(2), 33–41.

Kis, O. (2003). *Modeli konstruivannia gendernoi identychnosti zhinky v suchasni Ukraini* [Models of constructing gender identity of woman in contemporary Ukraine]. *Kulturologichnyi chasopys "I"*, 27. Available at: <http://www.ji.lviv.ua/n27texts/kis.htm>

Kochkina, E. (1999). *Яhenshчинн в rossiskih organah vlasti* [Women in Russian state bodies]. *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost*, 1, 173–183.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1998). *Ethnic Relations and Western Political Theory*. In Magda Opolski, ed. *Managing Diversity in Plural Societies: Minorities, Migration and Nation-Building in Post-Communist Europe*. Ottawa: Forum Eastern Europe.

Makara, O. (2003). *Gendernyj balans na rynky pratsi v Ukraini: mozhlyvisti analizu I prognozyvannia*. [Gender equilibrium in labor market in Ukraine: opportunities for analysis and prediction]. *Gender: realii ta perspektyvy v ukrainskomu suspilstvi*. Kyiv: PTS Foliant.

Marlier, E. et al. (2007). *The EU and Social Inclusion: Facing the challenges*. Eric Marlier, A.B. Atkinson, Bea Cantillon and Brian Nolan. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Martinelli, A. (2005). *Global Modernization: Rethinking the project of modernity*. London: SAGE Publications.

Mies, M. & Shiva, V. (1993) *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books.

Pearson, J.L (2007). *Multicultural feminism and sisterhood among women of color in social change dialogue*, *Howard Journal of Communications*, vol. 18(1), 87-109.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: SAGE Publications.

Savelyev, Y. (2011). European Integration and Trends of Development of Eastern European Borderland, Proceedings of National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy", Vol. 122, 71–79.

Schmidt, V.H. (2006). Multiple modernities or varieties of modernity?, *Current Sociology*, Vol.54, 77–97.

Schmidt, V.H. (2010). Modernity and diversity: Reflections on the controversy between modernization theory and multiple modernists, *Social Science Information*, Vol. 49, 511 – 538.

Shohat, E. (2001). *Talking visions: Multicultural feminism in a transnational age*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Sowell, T. (2004). *Affirmative action around the world : an empirical study*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Spengler, O. (1991 [1923]) *Zakat Evropy [The Decline of the West]*. Vol. 2. Samosoznanie evrpeiskoi kultury Moskva: Politizdat.

Therborn, G. (2003). Entangled Modernities, *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 6, 293 – 305.

Tikhonova N. (2011). Osobennosti normative-tsennostnoi sistemy rosijskogo obshchstva cherez prozmy teorii modernizatsii [Peculiarities of norms and values system of Russian society in terms of theory of modernization]. *TERRA ECONOMICUS*, 9 (2), 60-85.

Tong, R.P. (1998). *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction*. Second edition. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

UN (2000). *The Millennium Development Goals*. Available at: <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>

UNDP (2008). *Human Development Report 2007/2008*. New York: UNDP.

UNDP (2003a). *Gender issues in Ukraine: Challenges and Opportunities*. Kyiv: UNDP, UN in Ukraine, 2003.

UNDP (2003b). *Syla detsentralizatsii. Ukralina: Zvit z ludskogo rozvytyky za 2003 rik*. [The force of decentralization. Ukraine: Report in Human Development for 2003]. Kyiv: UNDP.

Vlasenko, N. ta in. (2001) *Genderna statystyka dlia monitorigu dosiagnennia revnosti zhinok i cholovikiv* [Gender statistics for monitoring equality of women and men]. Kyiv: Instytut derzhavy i prava.

Wagner, P. (2011). *Violence and justice in global modernity: Reflections on South Africa with world-sociological intent*, *Social Science Information*, 50, 483–504.

Wagner, P. (2010). *Multiple Trajectories of Modernity: Why Social Theory Needs Historical Sociology*, *Thesis Eleven*, Vol. 100, 53 – 60.

Walby, S. (1997). *Gender Transformations*. London: Routledge.

Watson, P. (1997). *Civil Society and the Politics of Difference in Eastern Europe, Transitions, Environments, Translations: Feminisms in International Politics*. Edited by Cora Kaplan, Debra Keates, Joan W. Scott. New York & London: Routledge.

Wejnert, B. et al. (1996) *Women in Post-Communism: Research on Russia and Eastern Europe, Volume 2*. Barbara Wejnert & Metta Spencer editors with the assistance of Slobodan Drakulic. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Wittrock, B. (2000). *Modernity: One, None, or Many? European Origins and Modernity as a Global Condition* *Daedalus*, Vol. 129 (1), 31 – 60.

Yadov V. (2010). *K voprosu o natsionalnyh osobennostiah modernizatsii rosijskogo obshchestva* [On the question of national peculiarities of modernization of Russian society]. *Mir Rossii*, 3, 46 – 56.