Maria Rumiantseva

COMPENSATION-THEORY IN THE CONTEXT OF CLASSICAL AND CONTEMPORARY CONCEPTION OF MODERNIZATION PROCESS: DUALISTIC MODEL OF MODERNITY, PROPOSED BY ODO MARQUARD AND HERMANN LÜBBE

Maria Rumiantseva[1]

COMPENSATION-THEORY IN THE CONTEXT OF CLASSICAL AND CONTEMPORARY CONCEPTION OF MODERNIZATION PROCESS: DUALISTIC MODEL OF MODERNITY, PROPOSED BY ODO MARQUARD AND HERMANN LÜBBE[2]

Regardless of all attempts to declare the end of modernity, contemporary political researchers still take its classical conceptioninto account and attempt to redefine it with respect to present-day challenges. Nevertheless, it seems that there is little agreement on thedefinition of "modernity". Consequently, a wide range of theories, devoted to modernity, have developed. One of the most popular is "multiple modernities"proposed by Shmuel NoahEisenstadt. According to this conception, modern societies can be defined and institutionally organized in a variety of ways. The reason for this diversity concerns the tradition and history of a particular society. For instance, intellectual and political elites in non-Western countries can produce their own understanding of modernity, combining elements of traditional politics with some elements of the classical modern program. Therefore, the role of tradition in the contemporary world is ambivalent. In modern society, tradition doesnot continually determine all spheres of life, including politics. On the other hand, tradition still influences the way in which modern institutions are organized.

However, it is not clear to what extent tradition can vary the origin-program of modernity.To explore this question, we examine the alternative conception of modernity, known as compensation theory, proposed by Joachim Ritter, Hermann Lübbe and OdoMarquard. We employ a comparative analysis and demonstrate the differences between compensation theory and the conception of multiple modernieties with regard to the role of tradition in modern society.The findings of this research illustratethe reasons behind the fact that tradition can influence the original program of modernity. It also contributes fruitfullyto the discussion about modernization and modernity.

Key words: modernity, modernization, rationalization, multiple modernities, theory of compensation, Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt, Joachim Ritter's school.

JEL Classification: Z19

[1]National Research University Higher School of Economics. School of Philosophy.Phd-student. Laboratory of cultural studies. Research assistant. E-mail: mary.rumyantzeva@gmail.com

Introduction

In philosophical and sociological research, the process of transformation from an agricultural to an industrialized society is normally identified as modernization (Ingelhart, 2001). This process, which has continued since the Enlightenment, includesfar-reaching changes in the economic, cultural, political and social spheres. In the economic sphere, modernization involves the division of labour and the complexity of economic processes. In both cultural and economic spheres, it refers to mass communication and globalization. In politics, it refers to the idea of actively constructing a society (Eisenstadt, 2000: 7).

According to the classical theory of modernization, one ofthe main changes relates to the rationalization of modern society (Weber, 1990a). Basically, rationalization means that formal-procedural rationality (*Zweckrationalität)* or in some cases substantive-value rationality (*Wertrationalität*)gradually prevails over traditional norms and customs (Weber, 1978). Following formal-procedural rationality, humans act in a rational and calculating way to reach goalsthat are based on self-interest. These goals themselves can be seen as means for other ends.On the contrary, substantive-value rationality refers to thegoals which are based on values, rather than on self-interest. However, despite the value-character of the aims, the ways of reaching them are still rational. These two types of rationality are quite different from the traditional way of action, where custom regulates both the aims and the meansof achieving them. Max Weber states that "one of the most important aspects of the process of 'rationalization' of action is the substitution for the unthinking acceptance for ancient custom, of deliberate adaptation to situations in terms of self-interest" (Weber, 1978: 30). This substitution could proceed in the two directions: either formal-procedural or substantive-value rationalities. In any case,the conception of rationalization presupposes that in modernity the influence of tradition and such traditional institutions as social class, family and religion constantly decrease. The relationships between peoplebecome subordinatedmore and more to formal regulations and institutions, rather thanto customs or tradition.

Despite the significance of the classical theory of modernization, contemporary researchers criticize it for its linear character andWesternization (Marsh, 2014). According toclassical theory, there is a convergence in the institutional and organizational structures of industrialized societies.If there are any differences between them, they will be reduced in the process of modernization.Moreover, modernization is seen asa process that has both Western roots and specific Western characteristics.From the perspective of classical theory, there is no alternative to the Western model of modernization: modernization develops in any society in a similar way as in Western countries. Although contemporary researchers largely agree that

modernization has Western roots, they reject that it has a Western character (Ingelhart, 2001).For instance, ShmuelEisenstadt (2000) points out thatthe facts verifyneither a linear nor a Western character of the modernization process. In the contemporary world, there is still a variety of differences even among high-industrialized societies and their modernization-model doesnot necessary imitate the Western one.

This critique stimulated the appearance of new theories and a renovated conception of modernization and modernity. One of the most popular of them isEisenstadt's theory of "multiple modernities." AlthoughEisenstadt strongly criticizes the classical theory of modernization for its linear character and Westernization, in some points he follows its fundamentals (Eisenstadt, 2000: 1).In accordance with the classical theory of modernization, Eisenstadtshows that the process of modernization causes great changes in different spheres of life. In the pre-modern period, the main regulator of these spheres was tradition. The principle challenge of modernity concerns the possibility of organizing these spheres not in a traditional, but ina rational way.The first attempt to provide appropriate rational conceptions for such organizing and to realize them occurred during the Enlightenment in Western countries. These rational conceptions form the original cultural and political program or project of modernity.

Despite the similarities between the classical conception and "multiple modernities," the main point of Eisenstadt's theoryconcerns the fact that the program of modernityhas changed over the years since the Enlightenment. Moreover, it has multiplied.Today,in the contemporary world there are a variety of modern programs. Nevertheless,this doesnot mean the end or collapse of modernity itself.According to Eisenstadt, the main feature of the modernityproject isits possibilityof self-correction. Consequently, it isunreasonable to examine modernity as an unchangeable, consistently realized conception. It is much more accurate to see it as a multiplicity of cultural programs, which vary over the course of time.Eisenstadtstates it in the following way: "the idea of multiple modernities presumes that the best way to understand the contemporary world- indeed to explain the history of modernity - is to see it as a story of continual constitution and reconstitution of a multiplicity of cultural programs" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 2).

In comparison with the classical theory of modernization, Eisenstadt changes both the notion of modernity and the role of tradition inmodern society. According to the classical theory, modernization leads to the rationalization of our world and, consequently, to human emancipation and that of society from the "fetters" of tradition and history.The theory of multiple modernitiesshares this view to some extent.Eisenstadt accepts that modern societies can not entirely follow tradition as a main regulator of life. Nevertheless, heargues that history and tradition remain important factors in modernity. To express it more precisely,history and

tradition determine the changes in the program of modernity and cause its multiplicity. In other words, the role of tradition in modern society has an ambivalent character.Modern institutions and organizations arenot subordinated to tradition or history. At the same time,tradition and historycontribute to their formation and cause their multiplicity. Eisenstadtpoints out that institutional and ideological patterns "did not constitute simple continuations in the modern era of the traditions of their respective societies. Such patterns were distinctively modern, though greatly influenced by specific cultural premises, traditions, and historical experiences"(Eisenstadt, 2000: 2).

As an example of this ambivalent role of tradition,Eisenstadt examines modern fundamentalism.He points out that fundamentalist movements occur more frequently in societies with monotheistic religions. Thereason for this concernsthe political and cultural traditions of these societies. Eisenstadtshowsthat monotheistic religions support the idea by which thepolitical system is seen "as the major arena for the implementation of transcendental utopian visions" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 24). These movements, however, are less developed in India and Buddhist countries, where "the political order is not perceived as a forum for the implementation of a transcendental vision" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 23). Consequently, the appearance of such political program as fundamentalism is also determined by the religious and cultural tradition of a particular society.

Moreover, fundamentalism is conceived here not as a fundamental alternative to modernity, but as a variation of the modernity project. Although fundamentalism is opposed to the West and to modernity, it appropriates some features of the classical-modern program and interprets themonits own terms.In other words, fundamentalism doesnot reject the idea of international or global civilization, but seeks to determine it for itself.Eisenstadt emphasizes: "Their confrontation [i.e., the confrontation of most contemporary religious movements, including fundamentalism] with the West does not take the form of wishing to become incorporated into a new hegemonic civilization, but to appropriate the new international global scene and the modernity for themselves, celebrating their traditions and 'civilizations'." (Eisenstadt, 2000: 22).

Eisenstadt's recognition of the influence of tradition rises a fundamental question: why is it that tradition and historycan influence theprogramof modernity?Modernization is based on the rejection of tradition and historical particularities. Consequently, according to the logic of modernitytradition and historyshould have no significance in societal development. However, traditionsdo impact the project of modernityand the rhetoric and programs of political actors. The theory of multiple modernitiesdoes not seem to explain why, from a political point of view,such references to the tradition and history of a particular society are so powerfulnowdays.

To answer these questions, it seems quite reasonable to provide an alternative conception of modernity, known as compensation theory, proposed byJoachim Ritter, Hermann Lübbe (1989b) and OdoMarquard (2000a).

This researchis focused on the role of the tradition and history in modern society. To answer this question,the theory of compensation is contrasted to the theory of multiple modernities. This research consists of six parts.We start from the context of this question andbriefly review the literature. We then examine Eisenstadt's conception of multiple modernities. As the theory of compensation is underrepresented in the contemporary academic context, the next two parts describe the main principles of the theory and the influence of Ritter's school onGerman academia and politics. Then,we move on toLübbe's researchinto European regionalismin order to present analyses of particular political phenomena in terms of compensation theory. Finally, we finish with the differences in the role of tradition in the two conceptions of modernity.

Modernization theory from historical and political points of view

To introduce contemporary research on modernization theory, we must first underline that the term "modernization" isnot free from political connotations and issues. As GilbertRozman (2005) states, this feature of modernization theory was quite obvious, for instance, in the USA in the 1950s, when at the peak of its popularity,it served to critiqueMarxist ideology and offered how newly independent states should develop.The situation changed at the end of 1960s with the war in Vietnam, when "modernization" was stigmatized as an American effort to legislate its imperialistic plans. The theory was revisited again only after the end of Cold War, when the fall of Communism became the important theme of discussion. Some considered this fall as the confirmation of modernization theory. They pointed out that the situation in Russia demonstrated the risks, which stemmed from changes in the process of modernization (Rozman, 2005). On the contrary, others emphasized that the fall of Communism demonstrated the incorrectness of modernization-theory itself. These themes, albeit employing other terms, reappeared again in discussions of globalization. In recent years,the theory of modernization has become quite influential in the USA. It is discussed with regard tothe ascription of anyWestern features tothe modernization model. In other words, the question is: could the modernization process occur without such "Western" features, as democratic politics and individualism?(Rozman, 2005). Following the approach used in the sociology of knowledge, Rozman's brief observation of the political connotations and discussions emphasizes the relation between theory and a specific political, social context of a particular society.

From the perspective of another approach, known as intellectual history, there are two main traditions of modernization-theory:the Anglo-Saxon and the Continental. As a rule,the Anglo-Saxon tradition of modernization-theory stems from Talcott Parsons, whereas the Continental traditionstems from Max Weber and Emile Durkheim. Nevertheless, there is a wide range of investigations that tend to observe both traditions (Schmidt, 2010). In these cases Herbert Spenser, Georg Simmel and Karl Marx are also considered classical authors of modernization theory (Ingelhart, 2001; Schmidt, 2010). Despite the differences between the views ofthe mentioned authors, they all are conceptually associated with the classical theory of modernization.

Following their respective approaches, contemporary researchers point out that the classical conception ascribes a variety of characteristics to the modernizationprocess.Some of them, such as "structural differentiation, cultural rationalization and personal individuation" (Smidt, 2010) or industrialization (Ingelhart, 2001), are still considered to be essential features of modernity. Other features, such as the linear character of modernization and its Westernization, are strongly criticized by contemporary researchers (Ingelhart, 2001). According to the classical theory of modernization, all societies sooner or later acquire definite features of a modernized society. To put it more precisely, the modernization process is linear. Based on the fact thatwestern European countries and those in North America became pioneers of modernization and industrialization, modernization in classical theories is identified with Westernization. Contemporary researchersargue thatthe world at present demonstrates much more diversity than classical modernization-theory assumes. The result of modernizationis not a homogeneous world.

In response to this critique, a wide range of modernization theories have been developed. Some of these attempt to distance themselves from classical modernization-theory by proposing an alternative conception that could provide another paradigm for social and political science.Dependence theory and world-system theory are just two examples of such theories. Nevertheless,Robert Marsh remarks that modernization theory now remains more popular than its alternatives. Marsh supports this suggestion with reference to his findings of appropriate investigations listed inSocINDEX (Marsh, 2014). He found 843 articles on modernization theory, 532 articles devoted to world system theory, and 503 on dependency theory (April 16, 2013). Moreover, statistically the number of publications on modernization-theory has been increasing (Marsh, 2014). Marsh also observes that there arerecent variations of modernization theory, the most influential being: reflexive modernization (Beck, 1992; Giddens and Lash, 1995), ecological modernization (Mol, 2001), evolutionary basis of modernization (Parsons,

1971; Newson and Richerson, 2009), values modernization (Inglhart and Welzel, 2005) and multiple modernities (Eisenstadt, 2000) (Marsh, 2014).

Multiple modernities

From the perspective of classical theory, modernization is a linear process, which sooner or later occurs all over the world. Moreover, modernization is associated with Westernization. These two characteristics of modernizationare criticized withina wide range of contemporary theories, multiple modernitiestheory among them. It shows that, on the one hand, there is a structural differentiation between the institutions and ideologies of modern states and political movements. On the other hand, all of them stay modern at their core (Eisenstadt, 2000: 25). To show thisEisenstadt provides a brief historical observationwith regard to the premises of the cultural and political program of modernity.

According to Eisenstadt, there are certain principalpremises of modernity. One of themconcerns the conception of "human agency", according to which humans no longer have a prescribed particular "place in the flow of time." From the perspective of this conception, humans donot have to accept reality. They can reflexively and actively form it. As Eisenstadt states, "central to this cultural program [of modernity] was an emphasis on the autonomy of man: his or her (in its initial formulation, certainly 'his') emancipation from the fetters of traditional political and cultural authority" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 5). The conception of human agency changes the conception of the future. Ifthe future depends on human activity and reflexivity, then a number of possibilities can be conceived. This corresponds to the idea that there is no given ontological order that legitimizes a definite political regime or social structure.

Eisenstadt shows that for the cultural program of modernity "the premises on which the social, ontological, and political order were based, and the legitimation of that order, were no longer taken for granted" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 3). In other words, modernity raised questions, which werenot considered in previous epochs. It caused deep changes in all spheres of life, including politics. The traditional means of legitimizing the present authority isnot suitable in a world where there is no indubitable ontological order. It impacts the relations between the political "centre" and "peripheries". The absence of a fixed social order leads to the active participation of "society" in politics. On the other hand, the participation of "society" means to some extent the politicizing of its various groups and their continuous struggle for authority (Eisenstadt, 2000: 6). "Society" and the "political sphere" themselves are no longer taken for granted, because there are no given or preordained collective identities in general anylonger and with regard to the realm of politicsin particular.

European states attempted toanswer the challenges of modernity by constructing new modern political and social orders. However, these constructions were deeply influenced bycontradictions, which were inherent in the European tradition (Eisenstadt, 2000: 7).These antinomies cause a continuous struggle in attempting to resolve them and stimulate political actors to find different solutions. Eisenstadtstates: "as the civilization of modernity developed first in the West, it was from its beginnings beset by internal antinomies and contradictions, giving rise to continual critical discourse and political contestations" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 7).Consequently, the contradictions of European society are of crucial importance in the construction of new modern social and political orders. Let us describe in somewhat more detail one of these antinomies as an example.

The contradiction known as the antinomy between "freedom and control" concerns modern conceptions of human agency and the future as presenting a number of possibilities (Eisenstadt, 2000: 8). On the one hand,modernization provides the opportunity for human emancipation: humans and society should be free from the "fetters of authority and tradition." With reflexivity and activity,human beings can achieve autonomy. On the other hand,when the future is conceived as offering a number of possibilities, humanstend to regulate their behavior in the rational way. This means that the modern society can realizerestrictive controlutilizing a wide range of institutions. Correspondingly, the creative dimension, which,according to the classical model of modernity, should be extended, has to confront the processes of homogenization.From a politicalpoint of view the question is: to what extent should the homogenization of collectivities increase?(Eisenstadt, 2000: 10)

Such contradictions could be considered the first impulse in the self-correction of the modernizationprogram (Eisenstadt, 2000: 9). Theyprovoke the appearance of "alternatives" to the classic political program of modernity.Moreover, Eisenstadt argues that the classic programitself isnot entirely a unity. Following the history of modernity, he states that even in Europe there were different political and cultural modernity projects. However, two factors united them.First, all of them aimed to solve the original contradictions of modernity. Second, all of them were rooted in the European tradition. The first "alternative" model of modernization appeared with the emergence of such international movements as communism, liberalism, socialism and fascism. They also attempted to solve the contradictions of the classic model of modernity. Nevertheless, they did it in their own terms and appropriated the modern program selectively. Eisenstadtillustrates it with the example of National Socialism: "though they repudiated the universalistic components of the cultural and political program of modernity, they sought in some ways to transpose them into theirown particularistic visions, attempting to present these visionsin some semi-universalistic terms" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 11).

On the base of these observations, Eisenstadt agrees with Nilüfer Göle's observation, according to which: "one of the most important characteristics of modernity is simply its potential capacity for continual self-correction" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 11). Another example of the self-correction of modernity is the selective character of its appropriation by non-Western countries in the period of colonization. With the influence of globalization the Western model of modernity spread to societies in Asia, the Middle East and eventually Africa. Nevertheless, this model underwent certain deep transformations. For instance, non-Western countries incorporated only "some of the Western universalistic elements of modernity in the construction of their own new collective identities" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 15). In most cases, they included "specific components of their traditional identities" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 15). In the other words, the appropriation of the classic model of modernity by non-Western countries was accompanied with a reversion to their traditions.

Although the described contradictions provided the first impulse for a self-correction of the political program of modernity, they should not be seen as its unchangeable characteristics. Eisenstadt demonstrates this, describing new visions of the women's, ecological, ethnic or fundamentalist movements (Eisenstadt, 2000:17). These movements have to deal with new problems and respond to new challenges. However, even those that proclaim an anti-Western ideology remain modern at their core. For example, fundamentalism in some respects is comparable to Communism (Eisenstadt, 2000: 19). Both of them are international movements and attempt to realize the total "reconstruction of personality, of individual and collective identities, by conscious human action" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 19). In spite of all the differences, both of these movements incorporate the logic of modernity. Nevertheless, in contrast to Communist movements, fundamentalist movements appeal to their "authentic" identities and in this way respond to increasing globalization and cosmopolitanism. At the same time, these movements do not deny globalization at all, but "appropriate modernity and the global system on their own, often anti-Western, terms" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 22). In general, fundamentalism appropriates some elements of modernity, for instance, its global character, combining that with its own respective political and cultural tradition, and proposes its own version of the cultural program of modernity.

The conception of "multiple modernities" describes different reinterpretations of the cultural and political program of modernity. It points out the diversification of its understanding, the de-Westernization of its idea and "attempts by various groups and movements to reappropriate and redefine the discourse of modernity in their own new terms" (Eisenstadt, 2000: 24). According to this theory, one of the important factors of such a redefinition is the tradition and the history of a particular society. Nevertheless, the conception of

"multiple modernities" appears unable to explain the reasonfor such references to tradition within modern society, where the legitimation by tradition is now irrelevant. To answer this question, we consider the alternative conception of modernity known as compensationtheory. There are two reasons for choosing this conception, proposed by Joachim Ritter, Hermann Lübbe and OdoMarquard. First, it focuses on the role of tradition in modern society and its relation to the process of modernization. Second, it is seldom presented in a contemporary academic context. Therefore, let us begin with some basic information about Ritter's school and then consider compensation-theory in more detail.

Joachim Ritter's school: context and influence

Joachim Ritter is famous asthe initiator andeditor-in-chief of the fundamental encyclopedic*Historical dictionary of philosophy* (*HistorischesWörterbuch der Philosophie* (1971-2007)).Along with the "Basic Historical Concepts" (*GeschichtlichenGrundbegriffen*), written by ReinhartKoselleck, Ritter's project is fundamental for the history of concepts (*Begriffsgeschichte*).In the late 40s, he also organizedaninfluential seminar, the"Collegium philosophicum." Some researchers state that it was precisely this seminar that played an important role in establishing Joachim Ritter's school (Hacke, 2008). The influence of the "Collegium philosophicum" in German academic life became obviouswith the university reform of the'60s. As a result of this reform, theparticipantsin the Collegium philosophicumobtained a wide range ofnew organized chairs (Hacke, 2008).

From a political point of view, the school of Joachim Ritter wasnot homogeneous. The participants in the "Collegium philosophicum" discussed and considered the papers of philosophers with various political views, such as Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Karl Schmitt, Georg Lukacs (Hacke, 2008). The members themselves had different political und cultural orientations. For instance, Hermann Lübbe was engaged in phenomenology, and OdoMarquard in the late '40s was deeply interested in the Frankfurt School. He later wrote, however, that the older he grew, the more his viewsapproached those of Ritter.Therefore, a particular political direction wasnot a fundamental factor in the formation of Ritter's school.

Nevertheless, Ritter himself had a quite clear political position, which he incorporated into his research devoted to the history of philosophy. Being formerly a Marxist, he statedin his later works that all attempts to "reshape the world" fail to meet the requirements of modern society. He based this statement on a philosophy of culture, according to which a specific interest in tradition and historyis a structural element of modernity. Hermann Lübbe and OdoMarquard elaborate this theory. In the analyses of particular cultural phenomena, they expose the heuristic potential of this conception. Despite their respect for tradition, history and

the continuity of generations, Lübbe and Marquardreject neither the significance of science and technological progress nor global economics. Based on this fact, some researchers characterize their position as "liberal neoconservatism" (Hacke, 2008). Theirphilosophy of culture, particularly the theory of compensation, needs to be examined in more detail.

Theory of compensation

In his paper "Die Aufgabe der Geisteswissenschaften in der modernenGesellschaft,"Ritter emphasizes the ahistorical and abstract character of modern culture (Marquard, 1994: 20). The process of modernization doesnot implicate the historical traditions of a particular society. Some elements of modernity are indifferent to the specificity of original cultures. It allows modernity to expand "without limits." On the one hand, this process has generated important features of the contemporary world, for instance, its global character. On the other hand, the historical neutrality of modern culture converted society into an abstract formation alienated fromits historical roots (*Herkunft*). However, interest in tradition and history did not disappear with the expansion of modernity. Moreover, contemporary forms of such interest first occurred only in the modernera. It was precisely in the modernerathat a wide range of restorationprojects, museums, archives, etc. developed (Marquard, 1994: 22).In other words, "disenchantment" with the world (Weber, 1946) leads both to the ahistorical rationalization of life and tothe reactualization of tradition and history, which could be considered anunpredictable consequence of this rationalization.

From the cultural-anthropological point of view, Ritter's philosophy could be characterized as a philosophy of diremption(*Entzweiung*). Diremptionis the state of a culture, in which an aspiration for progress is balanced bya longing for the culture's origin, or roots (*Herkunft*)[3]. In other words, Ritter analyzes modern culture with a model, where the two poles conflict and stimulate each other.For example, the technical character of modern civilization is compensated for (kompensieren) bythe "opening" of nature as an untouched landscape. Human objectification leads to a special interest in individuality and subjectivity. (Marquard, 1994: 22). The fruitfulnessofthis conflict is all the greater when both poles have legitimate stakes in the culture. Ritter's approach helps to prevent two extreme positions. These are the celebration of progress, as the essence of modernity, and the condemnation of progress, as the responsible party for contemporary cultural decadence (Plotnikov, 1994).

Under the influence of Ritter,Hermann Lübbe and OdoMarquard stress the diremptionof modernity. Nevertheless,Lübbe argues, that modernity is a unique historical phenomenon. The

---

[3] In German there is a word play between "*Zukunft*" (past) and "*Herkunft*" (origin). This play stresses the bipolar character of modernity.

reason for the wide dissemination of modernity isnot its ahistorical character but its specific temporal dynamics (Lübbe, 2003: 286). The dynamics of modernity is much faster than that of other cultures. Therefore,its spatial expansion is a result of the unique temporal structure of modernity. Ritter contrasts "ahistorical modernity" with "historical cultures." Whereas Lübbe (2003) contrasts "segments of culture with the intense dynamics of development" and "segments of culture with little dynamics orare opposed to progress." Lübberejects Ritter's division of cultures and proposes the division of tendencies withina single culture. Lübbe's interpretation allows usto recognize clearly the "historical" tendencies in a culture, the dynamics of which is based on an "ahistorical" modernization process. Moreover, it allowsus to describe the relation between two types of tendencies in modernity: theirharmonization and conflict.

Marquard states that modernity begins when human beings methodically reject tradition. In his paper "ZukunftbrauchtHerkunft" ["The Future Needs an Origin"] (Marquard, 2000b: 67),Marquard points out the following tendencies that neutralize tradition:

- Contemporary natural science. To get a result that can be experimentally verified, contemporary natural science strives for independence fromtradition and the "authentic" culture.

- Technology. The global reach of technologyresults in a deep transformation of ordinary life: traditional practices are transformed into functional.

- Contemporary economics. Money could replace products with commodities, because it is neutral to tradition. This is the necessary condition for the appearance of a global market.

- Contemporary media. Technology and education, both of which are independent of the traditional language,provide the opportunity to transmit more information faster.

The logic of modernization schematically could be described in the following way: the more the future is independent of tradition, the fasterthe modernization process. With increasing knowledge, knowledge-based technology becomes better. With the development of economics, technologies expand faster. With the expansion of new media, access to new and more knowledge becomes easier and faster, which in turn stimulates an increase in knowledge. According toMarquard, modernity is the "world of accelerating changes" – "*Welt der Wandlungsbeschleunigung*" - (Marquard, 2000b: 69). In this logic of acceleration,tradition decelerates the speed of the modernization process. However, that process is only one pole of modern culture. The other pole is a compensation for its consequences.

There are different forms of compensation: from reactualization and conservation of history to the rejection of modernization. Marquard strongly criticizes the second possibility. He states that it is inconsistentto reject modernization. Modernization forms the "global," "standardized," "uniform" world. These characteristics of modernization support and cause each other. Therefore, modernization should be considered a unified phenomenon. For instance,

unification provides the opportunities for natural science to get verified results. As a result of this, technology can transform traditional practices into functional, global economics can work with controlled indexes, replacing products with commoditiesetc. (Marquard, 2000a: 57). Consequently, to criticize modernization as a unified phenomenon means to criticize all of its specific characteristics. In other words, it is inconsistent to attack unification and also, for instance, to celebrate globalization. Moreover, to reject modernization means to reject the development of the modern conditions of life. "Nobody could sincerely want to return to the time, when, for example, surgery had to proceed without anesthesia" (Marquard, 2000b: 68). Nevertheless, for human beings today, because of our anthropological features, it is hard to sustainthe conditions modernization provides. The problemsconcernthe human identityin modern society and our orientation in this accelerating pace of change in the world. To solve these problems, humansfeel a need for compensation, the second pole of modern culture. From a political point of view, one of the forms of such compensation in Europe is regionalism. This phenomenon was analyzed in depth by Hermann Lübbe. It seems reasonable to provide this analysis to demonstrate the heuristic potential of the theory.

Regionalism

European regionalism is based on two main oppositions. The first of these is that between a European and a local identity. The secondopposition is that between a national and a local identity. Nevertheless,these oppositions take a variety of forms. Regionalism isnot a homogeneous phenomenon. Lübbe points out six types of contemporary regionalism and emphasizes that this list isnot exhaustive (Lübbe, 1989a: 30). The main pointis that most of them concern an ethnos and an ethnic culture. Regionalism can assert religious or ethnic minorityrights in the context of the nation state. In this case,its aim is to savecultural traditions and practices, for instance, a language. It can take the form of separatism and assert rights against the nation state. It can also assert itself as a separatismwithin the framework of a nation state when the aim is to get special administrative status and greater freedom for solving local problems. In contrast to theseregionalisms, it can also transcend regional and national borders. In such cases, regionalism calls for cooperation between different regions. On the one hand, such cooperation is based on the need for a combined effort to resolve common problems. On the other hand, it can also concern ethnic, language and historical similarities.

In spite of all these differences, Lübbe points out some common features of theseregionalisms (Lübbe, 1989a: 34). First, regionalismis based on the desire to uphold differences, be they cultures, languages, peoples, traditions and even landscapes. Contemporary economics, technologyand tourism lead tostandardization, and, consequently,a reduction in

regional specificity. According to the compensation-theory,the more society suffers from unification, the more it emphasizes its uniqueness. The regionalists convert this call for uniqueness to the political program, stressing the authenticity of a culture. Second, this stress on the uniqueness and the reference to the historical and cultural singularities doesnot mean a return to the pre-modern period. On the contrary, during pre-modern period there was no needfor the conservation and reactualization of historyand traditions. This special interest in them appearedonly when the pace of the changes started accelerating. As a consequence of the dynamics of modernity, cultural and political phenomena become outdated faster and faster. To compensate of this modern dynamics, humans refer to the cultural past and origin. Third, regionalism concerns the problem of identity. To construct local identity, different types of regionalism canrefer to nation, history, language, "authentic" culture or landscape. This local identity can be perceived as more attractive thanan abstract European one.

To sum everything up, regionalism is a compensation for modernization, satisfying the social requirement for constructing identity (Lübbe, 1989a: 37). This requirement occurs as a result of the alienating character of modern society. In the modernera, humans have numerous affiliations and, consequently,must play many functional roles. In other words, modern society is strongly differentiated. For this reason, the question of identitybecomes critical. There are different strategies for solving this problem. One of them is to reduce our complex identity to only one role, for example, the role of townsman. In this case, other roles have no significance. Lübbe strongly criticizes this way of constructing personal identity. He states, that humans should construct their identity not by reduction, but through narration. Narration allowsa person to unite different roles and avoids fanaticism.

Consequently, there is no contradiction between different identities, particularly, between European and local identities (Lübbe, 1989a: 39). Both a region and Europe have their respective traditions and history, which should be realized and preserved. To reject a European or national identity in favor of a regional one is to makea politically motivated reduction, which can lead to dangerous consequences. In other words, Lübbe's analyses aim not only to describea significant phenomenon, but also to determine its acceptable forms. When regionalism meets the horizon of the nation state and Europe, it can be quite acceptable. Whereas regionalism aims to support the rights of minorities, the nation state aims to support the rights of the majority (Lübbe, 1989a: 44). And in some cases they can and do balance and harmonize each other.

Multiple modernitiesand theory of compensation

Contrasting the theory of compensation and that of multiple modernities, itis reasonable to start not with the role of tradition in modern society, but with the conception of

modernityitself. According to Eisenstadt, the main characteristic of modernity is its potential for self-correction. New political actors could appropriate the classic model of modernity partially and fragmentarily. As a result, the conception of modernity diversifies, and a wide range of new models arise. Nevertheless, all these models remain modernat their core. They all incorporate some principal characteristics of modernity. Even if they attempt to affect changes inthe actual world order, as in case of fundamentalism, they do so in modern way. According to this definition of modernity, it is quite difficult to point out its main characteristics, or to perceive the limits of its changeability. Conversely,Lübbe states that one of the main features of modernity is its accelerating pace of change.The authors of compensation-theory define the factors, which make our world more homogenous and modernized. Economics, technology, science and media stimulatethe speed of modernity and form a standardized and uniform world. The faster this process, the more humansseek to compensatefor it. This definition of modernity allowsus to point to segments of society with an increasing dynamicand to distinguish them analytically from the tendencies with little dynamics or are opposed to progress.

Different definitions of modernity result in different definitions of tradition. According to Eisenstadt,tradition hasan ambivalent character in modern society. On the one hand, tradition or history cannot regulate the political, economical or scientific spheres. They lose the regulative functions that they played in the pre-modern period. On the other hand,tradition can influence our understanding of modernity and the way to its realization.Nevertheless, Eisenstadt doesnot consider an increasing interest in tradition and history as a structural component of modernity itself. On the contrary,the authors of compensation theory state that an interest in tradition and history is relative new. First, it arose in the modern period as a compensation for the modernizationprocess. These authors propose the conception of bipolar modernity, according to which the process of modernization is accompanied with some sort of compensation (Lübbe, 2003; Marquard, 1994; Marquard, 2000a). Modernization and compensation are both structural elements of modernity. In other words,the faster tradition becomes outdated, the more interest it arouses. This interest in the tradition and history can also be used from a political point of view in the rhetoric and programs of political actors (Lübbe, 1989a).

Conclusion

Our study proposedan explanation of the role of tradition within modern society. To answer this question, we examined two influential conceptions: "multiple-modernities" theory and "compensation theory." These conceptions were contrasted with each other and compared with the classical theory of modernization. Since "compensation theory" is seldom presented in an academic context, we also provided basic information about its authors.

The main thesis of this paper, which distinguishedthe two conceptions mentioned above, concerned the relationship between modernizied and historical tendencies within a particular culture. According to "multiple modernities" theory, the authentic tradition and the history of a particular society are important factors, stimulating diversification of modernity. However, they arenot considered to be structural elements of modernity itself. On the contrary, "compensation theory" states that the increasing interest in historyand, in particular, tradition is constitutive for modern society. Most importantly, it occurs in the modernera as compensation of modernization-process.

The results of our research could contribute to the discussion about modernization, providing a new conceptual frame for analyzing contemporary cultural and political phenomena. The recognition of tradition as a constitutive element of modernity allows to analyze these phenomena in more detail.The bipolar model of culture, proposed by the authors of compensation theory, draws a clear analytical distinction between the segments of culture with high dynamics and those segments of culture with little or opposite to the progress dynamics. This distinction has great analytic potential and could be employed in empirical cultural-sociological research.

Bibliography

Eisenstadt, ShmuelNoah(2000)*Multiple Modernities.*Daedalus, Vol. 129, No. 1. [Online] MIT Press. P. 1- 29.Downloaded at Uppsala Universitetsbibliotekfrom: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20027613 [Accessed: 14th Novermber 2014].

Hacke, Jens(2008) *Philosophie der Bürgelichkeit. Die liberalkonservativeBegründung der Bundesrepublik.* 2 Aufl.Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&RuprechtGmbH&Co.

Ingelhart, Ronald(2001)*Sociological theories of modernization.*In: Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes (eds.),*International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences.* Amsterdam; New York: Elsevier.P. 9965 – 9971. Downloaded at Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek.

Lübbe, Hermann(1989a) *Die große und die kleine Welt. RegionalismusalseuropäischeBewegung.* In:Lübbe, H. *Die Aufdringlichkeit der Geschichte.* Graz; Wien;Koeln: Styria. S. 30-46.

Lübbe, Hermann(1989b) *Erfahrungsverluste und Kompensationen.*In:Lübbe H. *Die Aufdringlichkeit der Geschichte.* Graz; Wien;Koeln: Styria. S. 105-119.

Lübbe, Hermann(2003) *Exkurse II. Der Streit um die Kompensationsfunktion der Geisteswissenschaften.* In:Lübbe H. *Im Zug der Zeit. VerkürzterAufenthalt in der Gegenwart.* Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag. S. 281 – 304.

Marquard, Odo(1994) *Zukunft und Herkunft.Bemerkungenzu Joachim RittersPhilosophie der Entzweiung.*In:Marquard, O. *Skepsis und Zustimmung. PhilosophischeStudien.* Stuttgart: Reclam. S. 15-29.

Marquard, Odo(2000a) *Kompensationstüchtigkeit.ÜberlegungenzurUnternehmensführungimJahr 2005.*In:Marquard, O. *Philosophie des Stattdessen.* Stuttgart: Reclam. S. 55-59.

Marquard, Odo(2000b) *ZukunftbrauchtHerkunft.*In:Marquard, O. *Philosophie des Stattdessen.* Stuttgart: Reclam. S. 66-78.

Marsh, Robert Mortimer(2014) *Modernization Theory, Then and Now.*In:*Comparative Sociology.* Vol. 13/3.P. 261 – 283. Downloaded at Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek.

Plotnikov, Nikolay(1994) *Reabilitaziyaistorizma.FilosofskieissledovaniyaHermannaLuebbe.*In:*Voprosifilosofii.* 4. S. 87-

93. (Плотников, Н.С. (1994) *Реабилитацияисторизма.ФилософскиеисследованияГерманаЛюббе// Вопросыфилософии*. 4. С. 87-93.)

Rozman, Gilbert(2005)*Modernization theory.*In:Horowitz, Maryanne Cline (ed.) *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas.*Vol. 4. Detroit: Charles Scribner's Sons. P. 1487-1490.

Schmidt, Volker H. (2010) *Modernity and diversity: reflections on the controversy between modernization theory and multiple modernists.*In: *Social Science Information.* Vol. 49(4).P. 511–538. Downloaded at Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek from: http://ssi.sagepub.com/content/49/4/511.refs.html [Accessed: 24th Novermber 2014].

Weber, Max (1946) *Science as a Vocation.*In: *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, trans. by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press. P. 129-156.

Weber, Max (1978) *Economy and society.An outline of interpretive sociology.* Guenther Roth, Claus Wittich (eds.) Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press.

Maria Rumiantseva
National Research University Higher School of Economics. School of Philosophy.Phd-student. Laboratory of cultural studies. Research assistant. E-mail: mary.rumyantzeva@gmail.com