

ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ПОЛІТОЛОГІЯ В КОНТЕКСТІ СУЧАСНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ

ISSN 2663-0265 (print) ISSN 2663-0273 (online)
Journal home page: <https://fip.dp.ua/index.php/FIP>

ПОЛІТИЧНІ НАУКИ

Олег Іванович ТКАЧ

Доктор політичних наук, професор,
кафедра політології,
Київський національний університет
імені Тараса Шевченка,
вул. Володимирська, 60, Київ, 01033, Україна

E-mail: tio19@ukr.net,

Крістіне АДАМАДЗЕ

Аспірант кафедри політології,
Київський національний університет
імені Тараса Шевченка,
вул. Володимирська, 60, Київ, 01033, Україна

E-mail: kristiadamadze@gmail.com,

Oleh TKACH

D.Sc. (Political Sciences), Professor,
Department of Politology,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,
Volodymyrska St., 60, Kyiv,
01033, Ukraine

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3131-1533>

Kristine ADAMADZE

Postgraduate student at the Department of Politology,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,
Volodymyrska St., 60, Kyiv,
01033, Ukraine

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5644-2690>

УДК 321.6

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL MODERNIZATION
OF GEORGIA AND SINGAPORE**

Received 29 December 2024; revised 28 January 2024; accepted 20 February 2024

DOI: 10.15421/352409

Abstract

The article is devoted to the research of comparative analysis of the political modernization of Georgia and Singapore. The relevance of this subject is due to experience of successful development in the political and economic spheres of Georgia and Singapore, which was facilitated by the dynamic formation of political institutions. Political modernization in these states took place in an accelerated and “compressed” format.

It is specified, that these countries are passing through rapid economic growth. Singapore, in particular, was part of the “first wave of Asian tigers” (along with Taiwan, Hong Kong and South Korea). Georgia, in turn, continues to demonstrate annual GDP growth, despite domestic political and regional instability.

It is stated that Singapore is a prime example of economic transformation under authoritarianism. Singapore’s economic success was influenced by many factors, both political (effective governance, professionalism and competence of political leaders, political stability), geographical (a small island state located at the crossroads of sea routes), and cultural (Asian values). The achievements in the socio-economic sphere as a result of political changes were so amazing that they even interested the main reformer of the PRC, Deng Xiaoping. Many Chinese officials and intellectuals see Singapore as a possible benchmark for China.

As for Georgia, in applying authoritarian forms of transformation, the leaders of the young post-communist Georgian democracy largely imitated the modernization that took place in Southeast Asia, including Singapore. The authors come to the conclusion that era of Mikheil Saakashvili clearly demonstrates the powerful modernization leap of the Caucasian republic, which was not afraid of temporary authoritarian measures to accelerate political evolution.

The Georgian experience of reforms became so successful that the fifth President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko (2014-2019) invited a Georgian landing of reformers to Ukraine to transform individual ministries – the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Economy, the Ministry of Health.

Key words: *political modernization, Georgia, authoritarianism, democracy, political leadership, Singapore, reforms.*

**ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ПОЛІТИЧНОЇ МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЇ
ГРУЗІЇ ТА СІНГАПУРУ**

Анотація

Стаття присвячена дослідженню порівняльного аналізу політичної модернізації Грузії та Сінгапуру. Актуальність обраної теми зумовлена досвідом успішного розвитку політичної та економічної сфер Грузії та Сінгапуру, чому сприяло динамічне формування політичних інститутів. Політична мо-

дернізація у цих державах проходила у прискореному та «стислому» форматі.

Уточнюється, що зазначені країни переживають бурхливе економічне зростання. Сінгапур, зокрема, був частиною першої хвилі азійських тигрів (поряд з Тайванем, Гонконгом і Південною Кореєю). Грузія, у свою чергу, продовжує демонструвати щорічне зростання ВВП, незважаючи на внутрішньо-політичну та регіональну нестабільність.

Стверджується, що Сінгапур є яскравим прикладом економічної трансформації в умовах авторитаризму. На економічний успіх Сінгапуру вплинуло багато чинників, як політичних (ефективне управління, професіоналізм та компетентність політичних лідерів, політична стабільність), географічних (невелика острівна держава, розташована на перетині морських шляхів), так і культурних (азійські цінності). Досягнення у соціально-економічній сфері внаслідок політичних змін були настільки різючі, що зацікавили навіть головного реформатора КНР Ден Сяопіна. Низка китайських чиновників та представники інтелігенції бачать у Сінгапурі можливий орієнтир для Китаю.

Щодо Грузії, то у застосуванні авторитарних форм трансформації лідери молоді посткомуністичної грузинської демократії багато в чому імітували модернізацію, що відбувалася у Південно-Східній Азії, включаючи Сінгапур. Автори роблять висновок, що епоха Михаїла Саакашвілі наочно демонструє потужний модернізаційний стрибок кавказької республіки, яка не боялася тимчасових авторитарних заходів щодо прискорення політичної еволюції.

Грузинський досвід реформ став настільки успішним, що п'ятий президент України Петро Порошенко (2014-2019) запросив в Україну «грузинський десант» реформаторів для реформування окремих міністерств – Міністерства внутрішніх справ, Міністерства економічного розвитку, Міністерства охорони здоров'я.

Ключові слова: політична модернізація, Грузія, авторитаризм, демократія, політичне лідерство, Сінгапур, реформи.

Formulation of the problem.

The process of modernization in East Asia was faster than, for example, in Europe. It can be described as “compressed” or “condensed” because it took place over a relatively short period of time and predominantly in urban centers. The results of such modernization are “compressed” or “complex”, which Ernest Bloch called “simultaneity (synchronicity) of non-simultaneity” [Bloch, Ritter 1977: 22-30].

When the process of development of the East Asian region included external challenges and exogenous factors, this happened quite quickly while maintaining self-identification. The rapid implementation of modernization projects leads to the transformation of institutions and social relations in a new social configuration, compressing modernity, because non-systemic actors appear both within the state and in the international arena. At the same time, the development of all these countries is not aimed at radical changes in sociocultural foundations, as Japan did in its time [Martinelli 2005: 44-46].

The same intensification of transformational changes occurred in Georgia, a country in western Transcaucasia on the Black Sea coast, which

has its own specific cultural and political features that are different from other post-Soviet countries that began their democratic transition at the same time and under the same conditions.

Research methods.

During the research process, descriptive, systematic and comparative methods were used, which made it possible to generalize theoretical developments within the framework of this issue.

The descriptive method helped to conduct a comprehensive study of the political modernization of Georgia and Singapore, highlighting the characteristic features of political regimes.

The systemic method allowed us to consider the political changes in these countries, which contributed to the formation of stable and stable political systems.

Using the comparative method, the reform of political institutions was studied, which significantly intensified the transformation process.

Analysis of the latest research and publications.

The phenomenon of democratic transition is studied in detail by various socio-humanitarian disciplines. The focus of researchers is on various models of modernization, including those

that differ significantly from the model that can be conventionally considered classical, describing the path of development followed by the societies and states of Western Europe and North America, starting from the New Age, and which, in general, continue to this day. In particular, a separate area of research has been the consideration of models of modernization that are based not on a democratic political tradition, but on an authoritarian basis – the so-called authoritarian modernization [Sztompka 1992: 21-23].

The famous American political scientist D. Bell and a number of other researchers developing a model of “illiberal” democracy consider the Chinese model of democracy to be quite viable, when power, according to traditional principles of social structure, is delegated to those who have passed an authoritative national competition [Bell 2006: 153-167].

Special mention should be made of the works of Guillermo O’Donnell and Philippe Schmitter, who conducted a comparative analysis of democratic transitions [O’Donnell, Schmitter 1986: 55].

A fundamental contribution to the study of political modernization was made by Samuel Huntington, who is the author of the concept of the third wave of democratization [Huntington 1991: 102].

In Ukraine, the problems of modernization and democratic transition are considered in the works of Tkach O. [Tkach 2021: 170-172], Zelenko G., Lyashenko T., Karmazina M. [Zelenko 2021].

The **main purpose** of the study is to describe the key points of the modernization processes in Georgia and Singapore within the framework of catch-up modernization; to analyze the factors and specifics of reforming political institutions; to determine the place and role of political leadership in the political transformation of both countries; to identify the specific features of political regimes in these countries.

Research results.

Authoritarian modernization was mainly characteristic of the countries of the developing world and the countries of the so-called “emergency market”. Several of its varieties can be distinguished: “educated” or “soft” authoritarianism

– in Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea; “strict” authoritarian modernism – in Chile during the reign of General A. Pinochet; in Indonesia – pro-socialist authoritarian modernism during the reign of President Sukarno and pro-capitalist – during the presidency of General Suharto; “party authoritarian modernism” in China; and “parliamentary authoritarian modernism” – in India and Japan.

For transitology and comparative political science, the examples of modernization in Georgia and Singapore are of particular research value. Both countries are parliamentary republics, have small populations and border seas. And in both cases, modernization took place in a short time, demonstrating great success.

The Georgian version of authoritarian modernization, implemented during the presidency of Mikheil Saakashvili, is of certain theoretical and practical interest.

Since April 1990, that is, after the declaration of state independence, several radically different stages in the development of the Georgian economy can be distinguished. The first is associated with civil war, increased crime, hyperinflation and a general financial and economic crisis. For example, in 1993, the country’s GDP compared to 1990 was only 31%; in 1994, the annual inflation rate exceeded 7,800 percent [Economic System in Georgia 2010].

The second stage of economic development (1995-1997) is characterized by the beginning of economic reforms: large-scale privatization, liberalization of foreign trade, simplification of the rules for issuing licenses and permits, complete exemption of prices from state control, creation of a two-tier banking systems, etc. Thanks to these reforms, significant positive results – annual economic growth was observed within 10-12%. Since 1998, economic stagnation began, expressed in an acute budget deficit and a significant decrease in economic growth rates. The social situation of the population deteriorated sharply. It is enough to note that by 2003, the incomes of 52% of the population of Georgia were below the subsistence level [Meskhia 2008: 74].

The economic and social problems that had accumulated in the country brought the reign of Eduard Shevardnadze into “deep stagnation” and led to the velvet “Rose Revolution”. A group of

young politicians came to power, distinguished by their daring, bold decision-making style and effective actions. At the same time, this group ruled a system that lacked “internal checks and balancing mechanisms” [De Waal 2011: 3].

In February 2004, a “constitutional coup” took place in Georgia. A few weeks after M. Saakashvili was elected president, the new parliament, partly in the “previous” composition (i.e. with majority deputies), urgently adopted a constitutional amendment, according to which the president received the right to dissolve parliament and appoint outsiders next parliamentary elections. Thus, parliament became dependent on the president and its control over the executive branch was weakened. In fact, this was the first step towards establishing authoritarian rule. The concentration of all executive power in the hands of the president led to a weakening and confusion of the functions of the ministries. In the spring of 2006, the President instructed the Minister of Defense to find foreign markets for the export of Georgian wine. For this purpose, a department for the export of wines was even created under the Ministry of Defense. In the fall of 2007, the president instructed the Minister of Internal Affairs to regulate high prices for salt, thereby entrusting him with the function of the already abolished antimonopoly service.

During the nine-year reign of the Rose Revolution government, a strictly structured state apparatus was formed, directly subordinate to the president, who has unlimited and uncontrolled power. This apparatus, using power structures (the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the prosecutor’s office, the financial police), exercised repressive administrative control over various aspects of public life.

Some researchers, in our opinion, rightly draw attention to the modernizing nature of Saakashvili’s rule. Thomas De Waal, a fellow at the Carnegie Institute for Democracy (USA), writes: “The new Georgian political elite, unlike its post-Soviet neighbors, chose a different path and... began implementing a special modernization project” [De Waal 2011: 1].

He also notes that “during Saakashvili’s presidency, Georgia undoubtedly underwent modernization, but we cannot say decisively that the

country has become more democratic” [De Waal 2011: 20].

The modernization of the country, first of all, was expressed in the creation of a “functioning state” and the provision of a new system of services to society. Houses of Justice were created, the practice of “Single Window Service” was introduced, centers for various services were formed: for example, the Registry Bureau, the driver’s license service, etc. Simplification of services and staffing with young personnel, mostly with higher education, and the abolition of outdated structures caused the elimination of so-called everyday corruption, which can be considered a significant step forward towards the modernization of the country. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that the government that came to power as a result of the “Rose Revolution” inherited a heavy legacy: in 2003, the share of the shadow economy in Georgia’s GDP reached 40-50% and total corruption reigned [Berglund, Blauvelt 2016: 23].

The authoritarian rule of the president had a strong impact on the economy. The establishment of financial order, an increase in budget revenues due to the tightening of administration and overcoming an acute budget crisis ensured the payment of arrears in pensions and wages to public sector employees.

Significant steps have been taken regarding business. Since 2005, the new Tax Code came into force, and the number of payments decreased from 27 to 7, which eased the burden of taxes. The import duty on agricultural products and building materials was abolished, the obtaining procedure was significantly simplified, and in some cases the need for any type of permits and licenses to start a business was completely abolished, and the procedures for state registration of property rights were also significantly simplified. Georgia quickly moved forward in the World Bank’s “Ease of Doing Business” ranking and even entered the top ten countries in 2009. The creation of a favorable environment for private business caused a significant increase in foreign investment, and this process, which began in 2004, reached its maximum in 2007 – the amount of investment amounted to more than 2 billion dollars. At the same time, the rate of in-

vestment growth significantly exceeded the real rate of economic growth. The reason was that investments were mainly made in the real estate trade and went to finance the import of consumer goods.

The libertarian ideas declared by the leaders of the Rose Revolution in most cases directly contradicted the measures they took in the economy. First of all, this was revealed in their attitude towards privatization and the protection of private property rights. In the 2010 US State Department report on the global human rights situation, it was written regarding Georgia: “Areas of concern are democratic institutions. Participation of civil society in the planning and implementation of public policy, the right to property and elite corruption” [Human Rights Report of Georgia 2010].

From the moment it came to power, the government of the Rose Revolution began the process of reprivatization. Many private property objects, under the pretext of correcting mistakes made by previous authorities in the privatization process, were taken away from the owners and transferred to the state for the purpose of reprivatization. It should be noted that the practice of non-transparent privatization affected especially large objects, which gave reason to assume the existence of corrupt transactions. Several times there were cases of payment of amounts less than what was declared. Often, to participate in the privatization of a particular object, a few days before the auction, companies with suspicious founders and capital were created, which subsequently won auctions and competitions [Welt 2009: 203-207].

There are frequent cases of violence against businessmen by the state, manifested in several directions:

– the authorities, using security forces, under various pretexts, forced businessmen to pay disproportionate prices for the acquisition of various objects;

– the government forced businessmen to pay substantial sums both to the budget and to various funds, most of which were controlled by security forces. The following proven scheme was in effect: the financial police or tax service, under the pretext of detecting financial violations, came to the organization, arrested several employees,

and stopped the functioning of production until the end of the inspection, the exact date of which no one knew. The management of the organization could find a way out of this situation only by transferring a substantial amount of money to the budget. This was the case with the Badagoni wine company, which was forced to pour hundreds of liters of high-quality wine down the drain. To avoid the destruction of all products, the company was forced to pay the requested amount in the form of “tribute”;

– on the direct orders or intervention of representatives of the highest echelons of power, businessmen disliked by the government were forced to re-register their property to persons close to the authorities, that is, they were practically deprived of their property;

– only persons who were closely related to representatives of the ruling elite, friends or businessmen who finance the ruling party could conduct business freely and safely [Aprasidze 2016: 95].

Despite the positive changes achieved in the country’s development and dynamism, in October 2012 the government of the Rose Revolution was defeated in the parliamentary elections. Power passed into the hands of the political association “Georgian Dream”. The defeat of the authoritarian regime of Saakashvili, in our opinion, was caused by the following reasons:

1. The political elite was not up to the task, which was mainly expressed in its incompetence and participation in “elite corruption”.

2. The modernization impulses coming from the highest level were not properly implemented, primarily due to the weakness, and in some cases due to the complete absence of adequate institutions in society.

3. Economic modernization was contradictory and inconsistent. Instead of a comprehensive one, a fragmented modernization was obtained.

4. Steps taken on the path of modernization were accompanied by restrictions on individual freedom, which significantly reduced the possibility of using the positive potential of modernization.

5. The attempt at modernization in Georgia clearly showed that in the long term, the growth of stable economic well-being of the population

cannot be achieved thanks to the efforts of a charismatic leader and even successful reforms carried out under his leadership. It is possible as a result of the existence of institutions that ensure constant dynamism, deepening the process of democratization, increasing the political culture of the population and, most importantly, as a result of facilitating the process of formation of the middle class. Unfortunately, in Georgia during the 9-year rule of Mikheil Saakashvili and the National Movement, these conditions were not at the appropriate level [Nodia 2016: 71-75].

In the parliamentary elections in October 2016, the political association “Georgian Dream – Democratic Georgia” received a constitutional majority, which, from a political point of view, approaches the model of parliamentary authoritarianism. Although the uniqueness of the political and economic situation in Georgia that emerged after the elections lies not in this, but in the phenomenon of the so-called “solocracy”, the essence of which is the concentration of informal and complete power in the hands of a person deprived of any state responsibility and obligations. Taking into account the totalitarian Soviet past, as well as the insufficient development of the political system and the facts of the indifferent attitude of a certain part of society to democratic values, it can be considered that at the current stage of post-authoritarian modernization there is a danger of serious obstacles to the movement towards a democratic model of modernization.

Let's consider Singapore's modernization experience.

Singapore's breakthrough from third world countries to one of the most developed countries in the world, accomplished in a very short period of time, cannot but cause admiration. At the moment, the political and economic model of Singapore is of great interest to Fiji and Sri Lanka, which are related to Singapore by their multinationality, island position, and common colonial past. China is looking to Singapore for ideas for its future political overhaul.

A study conducted by Knight Frank and City Private Wealth showed that Singapore ranks first in the world in terms of GDP per capita. It is expected that this position will be maintained until 2050 [The Wealth Report 2012].

In 1959, Seymour Martin Lipset argued that modernizing a country promotes democratization. Lipset understood modernization as the development of industrialization, urbanization, welfare and education. This definition has since been extrapolated to include respect for human rights, recognition by intergovernmental organizations, popularity in the global economy, and much more. It is expected that the growth of these indicators will contribute to the transition to democracy and further consolidation.

Before the Cold War, the theory of modernization was significantly Eurocentric, since most countries fit well into this theory. Contradictory results in the countries of the third world and the former Soviet republics began to embolden his critics. However, the biggest challenge to modernization theory came from Southeast Asia. Over the past fifty years, there has been enormous economic development (or the lack of it) regardless of the type of regime. The biggest exception is Singapore, which has a partially democratic regime [Lipset 1994: 102]

Singapore's colonial history and democratic traditions differ from its regional neighbors. Singapore was colonized by the British in 1819 and was governed by the British Legislative Council. Although local residents were not represented in the Council, governors often listened to public opinion and feedback. The relations were so amicable that locals welcomed the return of British rule following the expulsion of the Japanese after World War II. The British then allowed local representation on the Council before helping Singapore move to representative democracy in 1958.

Since gaining independence in 1965, the former British colony has become a major economic and financial center of the world. Conservative economist Milton Friedman described Singapore as an example of how to do development.

“If you compare the state of economic and social development in Singapore with the development of Red China or even Indonesia, you will see that economic freedom is a very important component of total freedom,” he said on the American program “Free to Choose”, PBS channel, in 1980 [Quah 2018: 97].

Lee Kuan Yew believed that Singapore's growth was due to the harmonious synthesis of

the values of different ethnic and religious groups. “Since 1965, we have had an indivisible society firmly upholding a meritocratic system that strives for the highest standards of education, the highest standards of productivity and high performance at every level,” Lee told an audience of college students in 2013 [Perry 2017: 25].

Conservatives view Singapore as a free-market success story. Low taxes, few capital restrictions and liberal immigration policies have made it one of the most cosmopolitan places on Earth. The country has one of the most progressive licensing systems in the economy. You can open your own company in Singapore in three hours. China during the Deng Xiaoping era largely copied the Singaporean model.

Lee Kuan Yew’s party program was based on independence, decolonization and decommunization, although there were many supporters of the communist trend in the country. However, people who wanted an increase in living standards voted for the future reformer.

Lee Kuan Yew considered the former British ownership of Singapore an advantage, in particular, he preserved the English language and the British legal system in the country, and rejected socialist methods:

“We used the advantages that Great Britain left us: the English language, the legal system, an administration devoid of party bias. We have carefully avoided using the methods of the welfare state because we have seen how the great British people, as a result of socialist equalization, turned into mediocre ones.” [Barr 2014: 33-35]

Singapore’s leader relied on market relations, a fierce fight against corruption, a high level of education and attracting foreign investment – these principles became the basis for the prosperity of Singapore. Major reforms were implemented in the period 1965-1990. Let’s compare the main economic and social indicators of Singapore in the 1960s with those of today. For example, the most important indicator of domestic national product per capita in Singapore in 1960 was \$400, while in 2018 it was \$57,000 thousand! Singapore’s education rate in the 1960s was 83%, meaning 17% of the population was illiterate.

Now the illiteracy rate is less than 1.5%, and

Singapore’s secondary mathematics and technical education is considered the best in the world (2017 report by Andreas Schleicher, director of education at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). In the late 60s and early 70s, there was no foreign exchange market in Singapore, but now the Singapore Stock Exchange has a capitalization of more than \$1 trillion and the number of companies operating on the exchange is approaching 800. For comparison, the capitalization of the Moscow Exchange is only \$200 billion, that is, 5 times less. For all other economic, financial and educational indicators, Singapore is, if not in 1st place, then in the top ten most developed countries. Let’s look at the major reforms that have radically changed the lives of Singaporeans and the country’s progress [Gomez, Can-Seng 2006: 12-15].

The name of Lee Kuan Yew is associated with a whole series of unique reforms that, perhaps, would not have taken place anywhere except Singapore. After independence, the young prime minister’s first step was to ban gambling and casinos, as well as a huge increase in alcohol prices. According to Lee Kuan Yew, these institutions in such a small state would hinder the development of the smart and law-abiding nation that he wanted to build [Caplan 2009: 67-70].

However, the most important and one of the first reforms was the fight against corruption, a phenomenon that corrupts society and authorities, eating up a huge part of budget money. I think everyone has heard the famous politician’s phrase: “Start by putting three of your friends in prison. You know exactly why, and they know why.” The fight against corruption in Singapore included several consistent actions by the authorities. The first is simplification of legislation and decision-making procedures. That is, barriers were eliminated for foreign investors and entrepreneurs who could create a company in a minimum amount of time, since the procedure for obtaining licenses and permits was virtually abolished. The role of the official was reduced.

The next step was to increase the salaries of top officials and judges, who began to receive hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, and the salary of judges reaches a million dollars. Such conditions and rewards discourage people from

accepting a bribe and risking their lives. The third step was the reform of the public sector – improving the quality of personnel associated with government activities. Lawyers and economists with experience and higher education were co-opted.

One of the most important methods of combating corruption was the creation of a special body – The Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau. This institution checked and monitored every employee, including senior officials, close ministers of Lee Kuan Yew. The activities of the bureau were effectively publicized, and over time, the population developed a complete aversion to corruption. Many of the ministers were imprisoned, executed, and some committed suicide. All these measures helped Singapore eradicate the main evil – corruption and move on to the next reforms [Besley, Kudamatsu 2007: 35].

The next step was the implementation of educational reform, as well as the creation of a powerful class of active, honest, enterprising citizens. What actions did Lee Kuan Yew take? A unified education system based on the English language was introduced, promising specialists and teachers were invited to the country, and Singaporeans themselves were sent to study at the best universities in Europe, and subsequently the USA. All this was done at public expense. Intensive education became a priority for young residents of the country, because all other concerns, even the personal lives of citizens, were decided by the state. Priority in education was given to technical, knowledge-intensive, information areas.

It is thanks to this that Singapore now has the highest quality Internet, maximum computerization of life, digitalization of the economy, as well as leadership in the production of new technologies. Of course, this policy has a downside – people in Singapore put career before family. There are almost no humanitarian and talented people left, since technocratic careers come first, and the country's culture is also going through a difficult period [Barr 2014: 41-45].

There is such a shortage of people with medium or low qualifications in Singapore that they have to be imported from other countries. For native Singaporeans, there are also no problems with employment, since from early childhood large corporations, of which there are hundreds in

the country, are eyeing them in order to invite an educated specialist to join them years later. This practice is not typical for most countries of the world, but given the small territory and peculiarities of the labor market in Singapore, it works well. Thus, Lee Kuan Yew and the government of Singapore relied on attracting technology, people, money to their country in order to create fundamental education, make a leap forward and, based on their developments, do something new and unique.

The fight against corruption and large-scale reform in education require enormous efforts, and most importantly, financial resources. That is why the most important task was to attract foreign companies, banks, tourists, and entrepreneurs to the country. Singapore has created a comfortable tax regime and a huge number of benefits for those who want to invest in the country and create jobs. For example, for entrepreneurs there is a measure according to which the first 100 thousand dollars of an entrepreneur's income are not taxed.

Also it has to be noted the duty-free (except for a few groups of goods) import of goods into the country. Singapore has relied on tourism; in 2014, 14 million people visited the small country, which is three times the size of the local population. It is worth saying that 73% of Singapore's budget is the service sector and 27% is industry. The port and stock exchange, opened in 1999, are of great importance for Singapore. The port of Singapore ranks second in the world in terms of cargo turnover (second only to the port of Shanghai) and is of global importance in trade [Low 2001: 28-30].

This port is the pride of the country and it operates on the basis of the latest automated control system. However, it is obvious that the development of maritime transit trade in Singapore is associated with the unique geopolitical position of the country – it is in Singapore that the Indian and Pacific Oceans and many sea routes are connected. The Singapore Stock Exchange is also one of the seven largest exchanges in the world and ranks second in Asia. It is also worth mentioning the unemployment rate in Singapore, which in 2018 is only 2%, which is incredibly low. This figure was achieved thanks, firstly, to the huge

number of companies, entrepreneurs and investors who create jobs and shape the country's labor market. Secondly, thanks to the education reform, which ensured a high level of qualifications of the working population, allowing it to meet the market needs for an intellectual workforce.

We should not forget about the daily life of citizens, the quality of which, of course, is a priority for the authorities. Thanks to strict anti-corruption policies, as well as the introduction of tough law enforcement measures, life in Singapore is one of the safest in the world. According to Numbeo (the world's largest database specializing in city and country statistics), Singapore ranks 3rd in the list of the safest countries in the world with the lowest crime rate. If we talk about order on the streets and roads, then everything here is also at the highest level. The country has banned chewing gum, which is prescribed in exceptional cases, on the recommendation of doctors, there is a speed limit of 80 km/h, and incredible fines have been established for violations, even minor ones, of public order. The small area and concentration of all infrastructure and authorities in one place only contributes to this. Being one of the greenest cities in the world, Singapore firmly holds the title of the smartest city [Jones 1990: 461-464].

Thus, thanks to the tough, uncompromising policy of Lee Kuan Yew, thanks to competent, but simple and understandable reforms, Singapore was able to accumulate huge flows of money, make itself the most important trade and scientific center, the basis of which is human capital and innovation, and not natural resources and wealth.

As Francis Fukuyama put it, the soft authoritarianism of countries like Singapore is a potential rival to liberal democracy. The model of soft authoritarianism becomes even more attractive for Asian countries if we take into account the experience of the Philippines and Indonesia, which adopted Western-style democracy and be-

came mired in political squabbles, while Singapore, skillfully combining authoritarian methods of governance with free markets, became a first world country [Acemoglu, Robinson 2006].

Conclusions.

Summing up the comparative analysis of modernization processes in Georgia and Singapore, we can note the following features:

1. Separate mechanisms for political modernization of both countries can be applied and implemented in young post-socialist democracies: Ukraine, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Armenia (for example, building an effective anti-corruption structure and qualitatively new law enforcement structures).

2. In both cases, during political modernization, a mono-majority in parliament was formed: United National Movement in Georgia, People's Action Party in Singapore.

3. In both cases, the goal of the modernizing elites was to overcome socio-economic backwardness.

4. In both Georgia and Singapore, investment and tourist attractiveness, as well as innovative development, have become a priority.

5. The special role of political leadership – the leader of the Rose Revolution, President Mikheil Saakashvili and father of the Singaporean nation, creator of the Singapore “economic miracle” Lee Kuan Yew.

6. In both Georgia and Singapore, society played the role of an object, not a subject.

7. As a result of political changes, GDP per capita has increased significantly in both Georgia and Singapore. Thus, according to the World Bank, in 1960, GDP per capita in Singapore was \$428, and in 1990 (at the end of Lee's reign) it was \$14,500. In 2022, this figure reached \$83,000. Regarding Georgia, before coming to power, the GDP per capita of this country was \$1,300, in 2013 - \$4,600. As of 2022, the GDP per capita in Georgia is \$6,600.

Бібліографічні посилання / References

- Acemoglu, D., Robinson, J. (2006). *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press. P. 432.
- Aprasidze D. (2016). 25 Years of Georgia's Democratization: Still Work in Progress, In *25 Years of Independent Georgia: Achievements and Unfinished Projects* (pp. 91-130). Tbilisi: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung & Ilia State University Press.

- Barr, M. (2014). The bonsai under the banyan tree: Democracy and democratization in Singapore. *Democratization*, 21, 29-48.
- Berglund, C., Blauvelt, T. (2016). Redefining the Nation: from Ethnic Fragmentation to Civic Integration? In *25 Years of Independent Georgia: Achievements and Unfinished Projects* (pp. 11-55). Tbilisi: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung & Ilia State University Press.
- Besley, T., Kudamatsu M. (2007). Making Autocracy Work. *Development Economics Discussion Paper Series*. P. 1-70.
- Bloch, E., Ritter, M. (1977). Nonsynchronism and the Obligation to its Dialectics. *New German Critique*. Durham, NC (11), 22-38.
- Caplan, B. (2009). Two Paradoxes of Singaporean Political Economy. *Ethos, Centre for Governance and Leadership, Civil Service College*, 65-72.
- Galyna Zelenko (chief researcher, scientific editor), Tetyana Bevz, Svitlana Brekharya, Maria Karmazina, Vladislav Kovalevskiy, Oleg Kondratenko, Nataliya Kononenko, Tetyana Lyashenko, Oleksandr Mayboroda, Yurii Shaihorodskiy. (2021). *Changes in political regimes and prospects for strengthening democracy in Ukraine: monograph / collective work*. Kyiv: Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. P. 416.
- Bell, D.A. (2006). *Beyond Liberal Democracy: Political Thinking for an East Asian Context*. Princeton University Press, 153-179.
- De Waal, T. (2011). *Georgia's Choices: Charting a Future in Uncertain Times*. Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Khaduri, N. (2010). Economic System in Georgia. In *Moving Closer to Europe?* (pp. 61-75) Economic and Social Politics in Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. Tbilisi, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Center of Economic Problem Research. Retrieved December 15, 2024 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321849922_Moving_Closer_to_Europe_Economic_and_Social_Policies_in_Georgia_Armenia_and_Azerbaijan
- Gomez J., Can-Seng O. (2006). Introduction: Stability, Risks and Opposition In Singapore. *The Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies*, 23(23), 5-7.
- Human Rights Report of Georgia. (2010). Retrieved December 10, 2024 from <https://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/hrrpt/2010/eur/154425.html>
- Hungtington, S. (1991). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Jones, C. (1990). Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan: Oikonomic Welfare States. *Government and Opposition*, 25(4) (AUTUMN 1990), 446-462.
- Lipset, S.M. (1993). The Social Requisites of Democracy Revisited: 1993 Presidential Address. *American Sociological Review*, 59(1), 1994, 1-22.
- Low, L.M. (2001). *Emergence of "New Public Management" in Singapore: A Case Study of the Ministry of Manpower*. Unpublished Honours Thesis, Department of Political Science, National University of Singapore, Singapore, 28-30.
- Martinelli, A. (2005). *Global Modernization*. London: Sage Publications, 44-46.
- Meskhia, I. (2008). Living Standarts and Poverty in Georgia. *Georgian Economic Trends*, 53-60.
- Nodia, G. (2016). The Story of Georgia's State-Building: Dramatic But Closer to Completion. In *25 Years of Independent Georgia: Achievements and Unfinished Projects* (pp. 56-91). Tbilisi: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung & Ilia State University Press.
- Nodia G., Scholtbach A.P. (2006). *The Political Landscape of Georgia. Political Parties: Achievements, Challenges and Prospects*. Delft: Eburon Academic Publishers. P. 268.
- O'Donnell, G., Schmitter, P. (1986). *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives*, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Perry, J. C. (2017). *Singapore: Unlikely Power*. Oxford University Press.
- Quah, J.S.T. (2018). Why Singapore works: five secrets of Singapore's success, *Public Administration and Policy: An Asia-Pacific Journal*, 21(1), 5-21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PAP-06-2018-002>
- Sztompka, P. (1992). Dilemmas of the Great Transition. *Harvard Center for European Studies Working Paper No. 19*. Cambridge, Mass, 21-23.

- The Wealth Report*. (2012). Retrieved December 18, 2024 from <http://www.slideshare.net/TheWealthReport/the-wealth-report-2012-knight-frank>
- The World Bank, GDP per capita*. Retrieved December 11, 2024 from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD>.
- Tkach, O. (2021). Democratic backsliding as a threat of a return to authoritarianism. *Political Studies*, 2, 170-185.
- Welt, C. (2009). Still Staging Democracy Contestation and Conciliation in Postwar Georgia. *Demokratizatsiya*, 17(3), 196-227.
- Yew, L.K. (2000). *From Third World to First*. Harper Publisher. P. 752.