



International Association on Social Quality  
Bredeweg 20-1  
1098 BR Amsterdam  
Ph: + 31.20. 6654923  
Email: [info@socialquality.org](mailto:info@socialquality.org)  
IBAN NL 47 RABO 0142767107  
KvK 41216943  
[www.socialquality.org](http://www.socialquality.org)

## ***Working Paper 18***

# ***The Transformation That Could Not Happen – or: There Won't Be a Clear Answer as Long as We Ask the Wrong Question***

***December 2020***

***Peter Herrmann***

***International Association on Social Quality (IASQ)***

## **Abstract**

This paper argues that the so-called transformation of the countries of Eastern Europe could actually not happen due to the fact that the politics and policies of designing societal development started from misleading suppositions. It is suggested that social quality thinking, if it wants to be relevant in assessing major historical shifts has to find a way of thoroughly including a historical perspective. This means not least to consider two strands influencing the development: the first is the meaning and effect of long-term processes, meaningful for the establishment of specific national and/or regional identities. The second aspect is given by the necessity of assessing social quality in the context of international comparison always as a matter of relationality, i.e. here a matter of what is going on between countries. Following this through, the foundation is laid for some far-reaching challenges for the social quality approach.

## **Introduction**

The recent development – as well as those of longer historical terms – in the Central and Eastern European region is by and large analysed in a limited, region-oriented perspective. However, from the perspective of social quality thinking this is an approach akin to going into the desert for a swim, leaving the – by no way clean – coastline behind. If we take the countries in question in the perspective of their origin into account, thus looking at the declared constitutive process, they all had been very different, however characterised by a common notion: in all cases they emerged in opposition to their capitalist past. Thus, point of departure of any analysis of the countries of CEE must be a complex relational and processual constellation. The example of Germany, and in particular the area which had been from 1949 until 1990 an independent German state, the GDR, will be used in order to introduce history into the social quality analysis.

While reference will be made to the German region, similarly complex constellations can be *cum grano salis* drawn on all CEE countries. Looking

from the perspective of social quality at these countries today, i.e. analysing their developmental perspective, has to take this into account as defining factor for all these countries. Any analysis has to relate also to some general questions, namely relating to the following:

- the *longue durrée* or the *temps relent, paresseux des civilisations*, the somewhat deep identity of each country as it emerged throughout history – here it is taken to be pre-WWII-era;
- the *temps alongé des episodes* as perspective that shaped very much the contemporary national identity as looser or winner country – a history of long-lasting episodes, as it manifested itself in the aftermath of WWII and the establishment of the two world systems, namely the capitalist and the socialist block;
- finally leading to the *temps rapide des événements*, the level of events: the daily struggles in search for a place in history, here and now.<sup>1</sup>

The fact that this search for identity and position is a matter on a personal level of people of the countries and also of the states in question makes the analysis especially difficult. In other words: the region and each individual country is looking to identify its own points of reference for what they understand as good society or high social quality. The problematique behind it can be summarised in four points: socialism in one country; socialism without capitalism as preceding stage; socialism – success in the periphery; gaining independence or changing the ruler? As will be shown, looking at these dimensions at least equally important is the difficulty in our thinking that still looks would physics managed to do: making a quantitative leap that allows us to see reality as something that is at the very same time process and structure. We need a social science of which we can say, *cum grano salis*, what Frido and Christine Mann wrote in order to grasp new developments in science: “Thus we can characterise quantum theory as physics of relations and contingencies. These relations establish, different to

---

<sup>1</sup> See the three planes of time Braudel, Fernand, 1987: *Grammaire De Civilisations*; Flammarion, 2002: 30; *On History*. Translated by Sarah Matthews; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980 (French original 1969)

only additive coexistence of particles unities, that are much more than the sum of their parts, while these parts do not exist independently anymore but only virtually as possibility.” (*Mann, Frido/Mann, Christine, 2017: Es werde Licht. Die Einheit von Geist und Materie in der Quantenphysik; Frankfurt/M: S. Fischer: 116*) Later we will take up on this, however at this stage we have to issue one important confusion, that makes understanding frequently difficult, namely the confusion of abstract – concrete on the one hand and general and individual on the other hand. Any concrete action, behaviour, attitude and the like is reification of a complex relational process in the said way, i.e. it defines itself by establishing a specific identity while this seemingly positive definition (“*I do, therefore I am cba.*”) is in fact a take on something ex negative (“*I am not wvu...a, therefore I am not abc ....z*”). In other words, the definition is given by specifically combining elements with a (con)firm(ed) result. And any choice made means at the very same time excluding what had not been chosen – what had been possible but had not been realised disappears into non-existence – as such it cannot be recalled; although we may have the impression to remember something from earlier times, it is not the same, the original cannot be repeated as everything else changed – something is structure and process, though in any single moment it can only be one.

Looking at the CCEs we find thus some remarkable differences.

Nevertheless, we find also some remarkable similarities when it comes to changing the point of reference, namely when we compare them with the countries of what had been “the West”. And often enough these differences can only be captured in a genuine way when looking at the life world.

Especially trust, social cohesion and social cohesion are issued in some contributions of the present collection. In all cases the overarching reference is made by an abstract concept of social quality, which gains its concrete shape by the concrete interaction. Translating such statement in something more tangible, means to say simply that trust in a fully-fledged capitalist market society is about drawing up contracts, each side aiming on tightening such voluntary, free agreement between two parties for his/her own benefit (“the shirt is nearer than the trouser”); in a planned economy the

individual interest is defined in a different way, coming from a different angle. While we may still call it egoism,<sup>2</sup> the constellation is a fundamentally different one: point of departure is some form of collectivity, the state – and this is relevant independent of a positive or a negative identification with the state or collectivity. Especially as all the societies of the region had been in a special situation of emerging formations, the tight rules of a clear resource pool, a definite regulative system of distribution, a clearly defined international standing and a definitive as well as unquestioned power structure. This had been a fertile ground not for relations that are – in the light of Westerners – classified as arbitrary and highly individualist, while in the perspective of those who had been socialised in the east depended on trust, often arduously and in a long process developed and often combined with various forms of mutual support. This is, pending further empirical research, also a reason behind the lack of polarisation which is in general and by definition<sup>3</sup> result of inequality. The overarching notion can be made out by accentuating that “West meets East” is just another expression of capitalism reinterprets the history of the recent past in the role of a missionary who wants to bring his message of salvation to those who were moving their own path. It could not be expected in another way: denied to move on, fighting for the own way, many ended up by radicalising the salvation, resulting in a more radical capitalism, a more inversed imperialism, i.e. the radical closure of borders and fertile ground for racism and not least the right-wing politics and moralist-conservative notions. The most recent is the change of the Hungarian constitution, providing a strict definition of traditional gender roles:

“The new Hungarian constitution defines family as ‘based on marriage and the parent-child relation. The mother is a woman, the father a man.’ It also mandates that parents raise children in a conservative spirit.

---

<sup>2</sup> may, though there are good reason for qualifying it differently  
<sup>3</sup> though not necessary

‘Hungary defends the right of children to identify with their birth gender and ensures their upbringing based on our nation’s constitutional identity and values based on our Christian culture,’ it says.

*(Dunai, Marton/Komuves, Anita, 2020/12/15: Hungary amends constitution to redefine family, limits gay adoption; Reuters; <https://www.reuters.com/article/hungary-lgbt-idUSKBN28P1N8>; 18/12/2020)*

Two seemingly marginal points are of importance when considering the development:

- The belittling of the change by dealing with it in an omnibus legislation, i.e. launching the major change as part of an omnibus bill (Act ...\_\_\_\_\_ amending certain laws relating to justice; <https://www.parlament.hu/irom41/13648/13648.pdf>; 18/12/2020) that deals with a multiplicity of issues, some of them relating to more or less simple administrative issues – thus the severity of the change is somewhat “veiled”
- The self-limitation of the critiques, focusing on the consequences for LGBTQ and the harsh restrictions, easily forgetting that it is the CEE-version of the “moral and spiritual turn” proclaimed in 1982 by Helmut Kohl – marking hand in hand with Reaganomics and Thatcherism a shift towards a new world view and new world order. It is in this context interesting that the phrase moral and spiritual turn, originally used in October 1982 in the Government Statement of the newly elected Kohl-Regime had been later transmuted into the guiding figure for the 1989-seachange (<https://www.thelocal.de/20181003/german-word-of-the-day-die-wende>; 19/12/2020).

Bringing this in line with the 1989-events, it makes perfect sense to speak of a take-over. The German claim “We are the people” had been mended into

“we are German citizens”, adapting the German basic law,<sup>4</sup> the quest for justice limited by the realisation of the state of law (see Herrmann, *in print: Racism a matter of daily killing; in: Junxiang Mao et altera, in print: Between Ignorance and Murder – Racism in Times of Pandemics; Vienna Academic Press Verlags GmbH*).

This brief description shows that social quality (changes) are not a matter of altering single parameter(s) but requires a structure-processual change, comparable with what had been said earlier: at any single moment something is structure or process but never both at the same time. This translates into the impossibility to apply concepts and terms like trust without noticing the conceptual difference.

With respect to social quality thinking, re-reading the contributions of this volume against the background of the present contribution will hopefully make clear that especially indicator research is highly in danger of evading the need to recognise the complexity – however, this means the return to mechanical thinking, considering matters as variable combination of individual items. Understanding trust and its demeaning after 1989 requires developing a deep understanding of the societal processes before the change which led subsequently to a transformation that could not happen.

## **Analysing Regional Development(s) – Social Quality in Context**

Looking at the development of the CEE countries in the light of social quality requires first to engage in a brief historical review of the development of the social quality approach. In 1990 everything started, first culminating in 1997, when the leading document of social quality thinking, namely the Amsterdam declaration, had been launching the initiative publicly. With this started not just a new thinking, but a reflection of real European societal developments that can be characterised by a few dates in 1989 we find the end of a “historical experiment” – for the time being we can refrain from

---

<sup>4</sup> The FRG did not have a constitution but a constitution-like basic law, always maintaining the “German Question” open.

characterising it as failure of socialism, the imperial takeover of the CEE-countries or whatsoever; it had been a time when the European Union had been still experimenting with certain programs in the area of social and welfare policies – while such experimentation came in the middle of the 1990s to its end, bidding farewell to a specifically EU-defined approach to social policy and society building. The reason for this had been the dispute over the so-called anti-poverty programs: a renewal of the programme-policy, now under the title “PROGRESS”, had been impeded by the European Court of Justice, following the legal action of some member states. European social policy – now in a narrow understanding - entered a new stage. To cut a long story short, this culminated in the Amsterdam treaty in 1997, the important part being the introduction of the employment chapter which had been introduced as a consequence of the foregoing dispute (see Herrmann, Peter, 1995: *Subsidiarity and the Wrong Reserve or: The Meaning of European Programmes Combating Poverty (Subsidiariät und die falsche Zurückhaltung oder: Über den Sinn europäischer Armutsprogramme)*; in: *Nachrichtendienst des Deutschen Vereins für öffentliche und private Fürsorge, Frankfurt/M., Issue 2/1995: pp. 79 – 86*). It should not be thought of as fallacious to see such development also to some extent as part of the geo-political shift: EU-capitalism did not endure the pressure from outside anymore and competition by an alternative system could now be overwritten by competitiveness on the global markets.

It is important to acknowledge this historical background when it comes to the analysis of the development of the CEE countries but even more so when it comes to the relationship and the specific integration of these countries into the existing European geo-strategies. In the same vein we have to analyse the developments within the region in question: the analysis of these countries has to go back to at least 1985 with the so-called Perestroika and then specifically with the subsequent development after 1989, when it came to the collapse of the socio-economic formation of an entire region which claimed to represent a different societal model. Such claim had surely been justified in the light of the development of society. Without entering a debate about the pros and cons of the political-cultural



and socio-economic system of these countries, they played undoubtedly the role of counterbalancing the hegemony of the established western capitalist system. Perhaps we should go even further back and look at the development of the new political approach after the cold war which found its first point of culmination in the *Kniefall von Warsaw*, Willi Brandt's Warsaw genuflection in 1970. Although it had been only a symbolic gesture, it had been most important for the entire future development, as it can be (and has been) seen as culmination of the entire process of the process of détente.

These two pillars – the development in the so-called West, in particular the EU as it existed until 1989 on the one hand and the so-called East, namely the EEC-countries – had been artificially tied together – while the phrase “What belongs together, is growing together again”<sup>5</sup> became a common dictum, the reality had been different. It had been the enforced secularisation of a specific form of “capitalist modernity”, going so far that Fukuyama saw “the end of history”. This enforced merger as interpenetration of a specific form of capitalism has been very much an expression of the general geopolitical orientation allowing that the winner takes all. Two statements are of major importance – Margaret Thatcher and Helmut Kohl, taken as Duo, established with their proclamation the relevant pillars. Kohl claimed “*transforming (the former GDR) into blossoming landscapes, where it is worth to live and work*” (In a television speech about East Germany after the Reunification [June 1990]; [https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Helmut\\_Kohl](https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Helmut_Kohl); 2020/10/27). It is important to note the exact wording, suggesting that life up to that point had not been worth while to be lived. It is important to note the exact wording, suggesting that life up to that point, i.e. in the GDR, had not been worthwhile to be lived or in other words: having lived in the GDR has been seen by Kohl and his companions as “lost lives” (this terminology frequently being used to

---

<sup>5</sup> [https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Willy\\_Brandt](https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Willy_Brandt), 2020/11/08/ with reference "In 1989, as quoted in "Confederation Again" (26 July 2018), by Brian Reynolds Myers, Sthele Press"; according to the German reference ([https://de.wikiquote.org/wiki/Willy\\_Brandt](https://de.wikiquote.org/wiki/Willy_Brandt)) this is according to the „Bundeskanzler Willy Brandt Stiftung“ a shorthand of the sentence „Jetzt sind wir in einer Situation, in der wieder zusammenwächst, was zusammengehört.“ (Now we are in a situation where what belongs together is growing together again. - transl PH)

describe the situation). According to Thatcher “There is no alternative” (*Thatcher, Margaret, 1980, June 25: Press Conference for American correspondents in London; <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/104389>; 2020/10/27 - she referred to monetarist policies*). Taking the two as Duo, clearly marks the plan for the future, which had been fully elaborated in the conclusions, presented by the Lisbon Council in 2000, stating that it “has today set itself a new strategic goal for the next decade: to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion.” (*Lisbon European Council, 2000: Presidency Conclusions; March 23rd/24th, 2000; Press Release: Lisbon (24-03-2000) -Nr: 100/1/00 - [http://europa.eu.int/comm/off/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/off/index_en.htm)-accessed: March 2000*).

Ideologically this had been by and large implemented, and it is probably fair to say that the current *Zeitgeist* is marked by the following characteristics: competitiveness, individual advantage, privatism, a weird merger between paternalistic subordination and . Importantly we have to recognise that this is not just an ideological reflection or subjective notion; instead, we are facing an objective constellation, that nearly engraves a specific habitus into the social fabrique. While this is socially differentiated, it can be said that there is a general norm, applicable to all members of this era and society. Thus we arrive at a multi-layered and multi-periodical structure of regional, local and social references, as it is tentatively and very rough presented in the following graph. It describes the major developmental steps of the region, then the countries, then the social strata. The shades suggest that the regions are more advanced than its people - the reasoning behind this is that the region as agglomeration accumulates progress, merging the progressive impulses from the different strata; the higher themselves concentrate a lot of it (“skimming advances and privileges”), whereas

others, “lower” social echelons are confronted with barriers, not having (easy) access to achievements.<sup>6</sup>

In short, though with a completely different notion, the transformation had been meant to be an adaptation of a development strategy that had been criticised — amongst others by the founders of social quality thinking — for its one-sided prospect of a social model of which the foundation had not been the social, understood as “the outcome of the dialectic between processes of self-realization of people (as social beings) and processes resulting into the formation of collective identities”; instead, it referred to an economic model, standing on the pillars of

- growth (measured in GDP standards) as expression of wealth and well-being;
- competitiveness as evidence of a healthy performance
- knowledge as instrument instead of acknowledging it as matter of socio-personal development
- social cohesion as reduced understanding of a complex relationality.

The problem is not new nor is it unique. Indeed, we are confronted with a long-term development that is standing behind contemporary capitalism – it has to be acknowledged, that capitalism is far more and different than the economic system of production that we commonly refer to, today usually are confronted with in contemporary debates for instance criticising neoliberalism. In actual fact, we are looking at different timeframes as they had been outlined earlier with reference to Fernand Braudel – the way in which developmental stages overlap and cross each other, is defining the concrete shape of any formation that can be seen as “capitalist”. However, looking at the developmental aspect, it is in the proposed perspective completely different to that of the mainstream view as it is brought forward in particular by W.W. Rostow (see *Rostow, W. W. 1960. The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto. Cambridge: Cambridge*

---

<sup>6</sup> This is admittedly a more or less daring formulation of class theory, limited to a very rough juxtaposition. While it is meant to be a contribution to a debate, it is necessary to ask for caution in order to avoid wrong attributions. Important is not least to emphasise the objective processes that are determining access.

*University Press*). He proposes consumption at the core of the entire developmental process – while production is of course a key feature, the level of consumption is seen as ultimate standard of progress. In other words, the social is defined as a matter of consumption. On the surface level this may appear as being the real cause of existence, as it cannot be denied that the market exchange stands at the core of the existence of modern men. However, this overlooks the fact that commodity production is only a means of production in a wider sense: in the present understanding any production, including the production of commodities, is part of the production of daily life. Frederick Engels contends this by stating “[a]ccording to the materialistic conception, the determining factor in history is, in the last resort, the production and reproduction of the immediate life.” (*Engels, Frederick, 1884: Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State. Preface [to the First Edition]; in: Karl Marx Frederick Engels. Collected Works. Volume 26. Frederick Engels. 1882-89; London: Lawrence&Wishart, 1990: 131-133 131 f.*) This production of daily life happens in a contradictory constellation, characterised by the fact of private property. Taking this as a point of departure, we can take up a very simple and straightforward definition of the capitalist formation in a very broad sense. Joe Brewer, in a small piece titled *This Is How Capitalism Actually Works*, states: “Here is how capitalism actually works – use a legal framework of private ownership to extract value from the labor of others. The end game is a system that hoards wealth, stifles innovation, and ultimately destroys the value created by cooperation among those who seek to do things that cannot be done alone.” (*Brewer J, 2016: This is How Capitalism Works; <https://artplusmarketing.com/this-is-how-capitalism-actually-works-b2907d1b4d78>; 15/09/2019*) With this in mind we can recognise the two inherent dimensions of capitalism: The one dimension is about the productive process and the role and function of the different acts and actors – historically this reaches from the individual producer, owning the means of production and producing more accidental some surplus beyond the sustenance product to the completely differentiated “three-class-society”, in which the actual producer of an element of the total product (technical

dimension of the division of labour), the owner of the means of production being alien to the entire process of production and the manager, alien to the production as such, though indispensable for securing the socialisation of the process, i.e. for mediating between use value and exchange value. The other dimension is about consumption, in its extreme form completely detached from the (re-)productive process – here value is shifted from assessing what is produced to assessing how much is produced. The latter is well expressed right at the beginning of Marx' *Capital* where we read: “The wealth of those societies in which the capitalist mode of production prevails, presents itself as ‘an immense accumulation of commodities’, its unit being a single commodity.” (*Marx, Karl, 1867: Capital; Volume I; in Marx & Engels. Collected Works. Volume 35; London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1996: 45*) The concrete and specific relationship and differentiated weighing and grouping around production and consumption and also between the different modes of control (knowledge of production, control of property, legal ownership ...) are decisive in determining the concrete form capitalism takes (a first rough characteristic is already given by mentioning finance capitalism, trade capitalism, industrial capitalism and servant capitalism). It is important that even before globalisation as it is known today any such constellation had not been a simple and straightforward “national decision”. Instead, we are moving along the following eight lines:

- The first is reflecting regional settings and conditions – the most obvious factor is the climate determining to some extent “what can be done”, how people are conditioned in their behaviour by natural conditions. Other factors are also relevant, also those that are by and large social constructs as for instance language, constituting not least regional “families”, thus establishing some commonality (first line)
- The second line reflects “what is done” on the national level – this can be understood as an outcome of power relationships, resulting in some form of national identity – war experience within a region, attributing a specific role and function, is one example (second line)

- While both can be seen as defining moment in the long run, they are providing only a foundation and seedbed for the establishment of a specific regional and national structuration of socio-productive and socio-reproductive patterns. Important is to recognise them as processing of complex relationalities: the *longue durée* interlinking with the *temps allongée*, and these planes of history interacting in both respects, the regional and the national, but in addition as criss-cross relationship, i.e. the long-term regional plane directly relating to the national dimension of the *temps allongée* – and of course, in the very long run even the long-term dimension is undergoing some alteration (third and fourth line)
- The same is replicated and multiplied when we arrive at the third plane, now witnessing the interaction of the three levels in the hierarchical line (regional and national) and the various possible interactions between the different times and spaces.
- Of course, further complications are given by the fact of interregional relationships, again concerning the criss-cross-interaction between the different temporal and spatial references.<sup>7</sup>

Should we speak of the three planes of history as specific attributions, the *longue durée* being a matter of mentality and general identity, the *temps allongée* the layer of structuration and definition of agencies and the *temps rapide des événements* reflecting the level of behaviour and action? The reading of works of the École des Annales suggests such interpretation, presenting an understanding that, using nowadays' parlance, can be labelled "deep history".<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Of course, while we speak of regions and nations, we should not forget that this is only a small part of the entire setting, fading out the role of different classes.

<sup>8</sup> Further reflection has to be dedicated to the contradiction between this approach and the ascending from the abstract to the concrete.

## Conflicting Historio-Structural Dimensions of Social Quality

There had been early discussions on the understanding of quality. One position held that it is a more or less open concept, referring to something being of good or high quality, without inherent criteria of what makes something being of good/high quality – in other words, the criteria are defined outside of the “object”. The other position sees quality more as a categorical question, seeing standards of quality as inherent to the matter in question (in this case: the social), and allowing more pronouncedly to speak of quality in a negative sense: it is not simply “bad” or “low”; instead, the “bad quality” is definable by clear criteria.

Referring to the second interpretation, we see the confrontation with two distinct layers of reference: (i) one concerns the social quality and its development within a given area (and across eras) – in the case of the present analytical goal we are in actual fact looking at two areas, namely the East and the West, or more specifically the EEC countries and the EU-member states. Of course, such analysis is limited by using a broad brush, outlining the cornerstones of the development – contributions of this volume will provide some hints; and equally important is that the pictures provided will be very different, depending on the point of reference. It has to be accepted that the *punctum Archimedis*, the Archimedean point, is in actual fact diverse and we may come to the conclusion that the social quality approach is an attempt to find some common ground. However, it is becoming especially interesting when it comes to the point where (ii) we analyse from the same platform the (potential) conflict line and tensions between different regions, concerning and reflecting the very same time the impact and manifestation of the different historical planes.<sup>9</sup> It needs some patience to allow engaging in such complexity, as we are caught in the tradition of pre-quantum-theoretical thinking. Social analysis without thoroughly considering processuality will always be stuck, limiting itself to

---

<sup>9</sup> This can also be applied in a comparative perspective of nation states or any other special entities. Further consideration may be given to a similar pattern for comparative research in regard of different social groups, including professionals etc.

dealing with relationships. This means not least, that any analytical perspective is bound to two limitations: the first is about the firm acknowledgement of the fact that assessing social quality is not and cannot be a matter of measurement (see Herrmann, Peter, 2012: *Economic Performance, Social Progress and Social Quality; in: International Journal of Social Quality 2(1), Summer 2012: 41–55 (doi:10.3167/IJSQ.2012.020104)*); the other fundamental limitation terminates in the argument, that such kind of assessment is bound to an ongoing discourse which underlies the same laws of processual relationality, meaning that it permanently refers to the conditions while they are changing due to its own activity – we may tentatively use the term (not only self-)referential iterative process. Of course, this means that most of these processes are reinforcing themselves, or to use another expression we see the Matthew effect. Looking in particular at the interrelationship of different references, in this case the different regions we see that the following two parameters are of special relevance. The first is the socio-economic standing of the region, independent of the way in which it is measured/assessed. The second, and to some extent subsequent, factor is about the power of one or the other unit, here concerned with establishing and utilising some form of dominance, in particular by establishing some form of dependency. Looking at the theory of economics, such imbalance can be seen in Riccardo's theory of competitive advantage – while this suggests equal power between different agencies, we can come easily to the conclusion that such constellation is first and foremost one of unequal power. The substantial power is defined by the factual (not abstract) relationship of exchange value and use value within and for the communities in question. Taking the classical example, referred to by David Riccardo, we see immediately that the goods in question constitute different powers: in his example he takes the production of wine being advantageous for Portugal, whereas the production of clothes is advantageous for England.

The baseline for this comparison is the time needed for the production of the relevant exchangeable units of each product. Formally this is of course correct. However, it is obvious that the exchange value of clothes – if taken



as matter of a generalised use value – is much higher than that of wine – the reason being obvious:

The saturation of the market with wine is reached much faster than that of cloths. Part of the reason is the limitation of storage; another reason is given by the fact of clothes having a more generalised exchange value than wine – everybody needs clothes; some may enjoy wine. Moving such an example to the extreme, we may say that the production of gold as universal means of exchange is much higher in value than, let's say, the production of strawberries. This is even then correct, if the cost of production is the same.<sup>10</sup> What applies to the production of commodities applies *cum grano salis* also to the assessment of values and political matters – all this is valid independent of the subjective valuation.

## **A COMPARATIVE SOCIO-HISTORICAL APPROACH – AN OUTLINE**

Against this background we have to evaluate the two regions in question in a comparative way and determine the power relationship between them.<sup>11</sup>

This can be seen as a framework that allows more detailed analysis which, of course, cannot be delivered here. However, the presented framework can be utilised to analyse the different regions in question and determine in a comparative evaluation the power relationships between them. This means as well, that this framework can be usefully applied when reading the contributions of this volume. Principally we are moving with our analysis in six fields which will be outlined in the following matrix:

|                     |  |                     |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|
| Region 1            |  | Region 2            |
| <i>Longue durée</i> |  | <i>Longue durée</i> |

<sup>10</sup> When it comes to the theory of value, this means that the cost of production have to include the reference to the time during which a product can be used. It is considered to present, a and b, the production of each requiring the same effort and time. However, let us consider further that the product a can only be used for one month whereas product b can be used without time limitation, value of product b is higher than the value of product a, although the cost of production is the same for product a and product b.

<sup>11</sup> – an additional problem is given by the fact that there are not only differences in the long term perspective, but as well similarities when it comes to some general values and practices.

|                                    |  |                                    |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
|                                    |  |                                    |
| <i>temps alongé des épisodes</i>   |  | <i>temps alongé des épisodes</i>   |
|                                    |  |                                    |
| <i>temps rapide des événements</i> |  | <i>temps rapide des événements</i> |

In which way ever we are concerned with social quality of the Eastern region and the individual CEE-countries, we have to begin with the analysis of the relationship to the hegemonic countries of the West if we are focusing the analysis on the process of transformation. In other words, we have to distinguish the process of transformation on the one hand and the region and its individual countries on the other end – these are definitely two very different issues. So far, going for metrics is only the first step, presenting the direction of the analysis on the general and abstract level. While we would ideally look at the social quality as matter of ordinary lives of ordinary people, we are limiting ourselves here on elaborating a very rough perspective that can lead to further detailed social quality analysis as it had been liberated originally subsequent to the Amsterdam declaration. If we take region 1 as hegemonic power, we still have to find a way that allows us to look at the substance that defines the hegemonic position. Only then we will be in the position that we can assess the process we are looking at and see, if we can really speak of transformation or if it is more appropriate to speak of subordination. In order to be able to do so, a rough and tentative developmental pattern is proposed – there are borrowings from Rostow and Clark, more fundamentally going back to Marx and Luxemburg. We arrive at the following rough pattern or pillars of the development of the economic structure in the long term.

|                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Simple (re)production of daily life                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Near to) pure subsistence economy</li> <li>• Rudimentary barter</li> <li>• Early trade system</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| System reproduction                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First financial capitalism</li> <li>• Early fabric system</li> <li>• Industrial capitalism</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| System expansion/enhanced reproduction of every days live | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advanced industrial production</li> <li>• Franchising economy</li> <li>• International trade capitalism</li> <li>• Emphasis of foreign trade balance</li> <li>• Extractionism</li> </ul>                                                                                                                     |
| Transition economy                                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recycling capitalism</li> <li>• Culturally oriented capitalism</li> <li>• Capitalist sharing economy</li> <li>• Behaviourism</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Transformation economy                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharing economy</li> <li>• Moral economy</li> <li>• Globalist sustainability</li> <li>• Extrapolation of the tension between increasing commodification and development towards the commodification and forms of barter</li> <li>• Re-regionalisation and localisation</li> <li>• Re-Parochialism</li> </ul> |

We find a kind of circular movement, which consists of two circles. The one is the large and overarching circle, describing the movement from immediate dealing with use value (production and consumption) towards an abstraction (in extreme case finance capitalism that lost completely the link to production and the regional economy) and moving further, back to some form of re-focusing on use value, now on an advanced level. On the second layer we find another circular movement, one that describes a similar path, however here we are dealing with a relative concern of the link to use value. To be more concrete, use value is not a matter of absolute concern but of the use within the given system/on the given level of development. We may say, such development includes the development from executing immediate power, concerned with the situation one is confronted with towards the societal power that is more or less distanced from every day is life. We can

imagine this is a power balance sheet with a shift between the two dimensions:

On an initial stage the power over the situation is more or less identical with the power and control of the wider social situation. Accumulation of power over the social situation turns at some stage into an overwhelming pattern, silencing the meaning of the power over the immediate situation. At this stage an additional level emerges that is now opening another layer of societal power, itself now distanced from the given “concrete power over every day’s life”. In very simple terms: for the small farmer, subsistence oriented, enhanced by some minor barter, bookkeeping is a “too large thing” to show any use value. In a developed industrial economy the work of the accountant of an enterprise seems to be as concrete as that of the worker at the assembling line – this includes that the work of the latter actually lost as much concreteness as the work of the accountant gained.

While there is of course “total power” in the case of simple sustenance orientation this power decreases with the increase of societal differentiation and the establishment of mediating bodies. This means as well, that in more complex societies it is at least more likely that societal power is outplaying individual power – leaving aside, that societal power can easily be transposed into individual power. In simple terms: being able to use a computer without being able to afford one makes the knowledge meaningless; on the other hand, having the material means to buy a computer includes in many cases also the resources to avail of the education needed to use it or to employ somebody who is able to use it.

This means not least that one dimension of societal development and the increasing complexity is about increasing societal, abstract control, the price to be paid being a loss of immediate control over life. While this is one very important point reflecting the general development of societies, another and even more important aspect consists in the fact that the question of property is finally defining the relationship between the two powers. While it is easy to imagine downwards penetration (societal power being translated into personal power), it is more difficult to imagine upwards unfolding (i.e.

the use of pure personal power as means to execute societal control).<sup>12</sup> This can also be applied in the perspective of a comparative look at different societies: a society that is producing products and commodities that are close to use value will have a weaker position than those societies where the economy is growing by the production of more universal values, and in particular commodities, as it means least, that the second kind of society is potentially undermining and subordinating the first kind of society.

As far as it is concerning the current debate, the important part is given by the fact that a growing distancing from the immediate use value – in terms of economic value and/or in physical terms – is enhancing the power over others. In other words, a product from agricultural work, best for immediate consumption, does give little market power; on the other hand, a product that is not even complete utility in its own terms but only part of other products that can actually be used by real people in real life, establishes a huge market power. While this can be seen as a general rule, exceptions are given in emergency situations, for instance under conditions of societal transition, where the dominant mechanisms of exchange and ruling are temporarily suspended. Another situation where these dominant mechanisms are undermined is given for instance under pandemics or other emergency stations where real use value is becoming more important than exchange value. The weight and direction of such suspension is not necessarily clear: Of course, at first sight money cannot buy everything; however, we might also find the situation where money actually can and does buy everything and decides over death and life. The following rough and tentative matrix gives at least some overview of the fundamental pattern.

## **Filling the Frame – An Example**

In a nutshell this results in the argument on three layers: (i) history matters – whenever it comes to the assessment of the country and its wealth we have to consider it – quantitatively and qualitatively – in a historical perspective; (ii)

---

<sup>12</sup> Trump as president may be taken as example, showing that such transfer is possible but also that it is difficult to maintain it.

any country or region is not only located in history but also defined by its relationship to other countries and regions – as matter of fact we are dealing with power relationships in a geo-political perspective; (iii) against this background people are developing their identity and at the same time – with this – they accommodate themselves and define social quality and quality of life in exactly the way Marx must have had in mind, writing that ““Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past” (*Marx, Karl, 2 1852: The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, 1851-52; in: Karl Marx. Frederick Engels. Collected Works. Volume 11. Marx and Engels: 1851-53; London: Lawrence&Wishart, 2010: 103*).

Against this background one important remark has to be made with respect to references: we are looking for information, that usually cannot be found in the standard literature present in libraries and journals. Informative are autobiographies and biographies and also novels, whereas the most important source is to genuinely look at and live with people who are agencies in this sense, i.e. making their own history.

Such approach allows the analysis of the development of the individual countries as well as the development of the group of countries or the region – as such it entails elaboration. We may take Germany as an example to begin with. The part that became the GDR, had been for a long time known as corn-chamber of Germany – the poor eastern part of the country, a status which had been inherited from Prussian times. Unquestionably, the situation after World War II, had been characterised by a major ambiguity: on the one hand, it remained economically a somewhat retarded area – the major destruction during the war especially in the eastern parts of Germany did not help,<sup>13</sup> nor did the fact that the USSR insisted on the payment of reparation. Nevertheless, it had been also a somewhat strong state, for different reasons a strong ally of the USSR, in some way stabilising the entire CEE region – this had been an important factor in respect of the

---

<sup>13</sup>

policy of the scorched earth when the fascist troops had to withdraw.

relationship to other countries, east and west. It has been commonly known, that the relationship between the USSR and the GDR had been firm and important: reflecting the Second World War and its aftermath, the GDR – before its constitution as independent state being one of the four zones into which Germany had been divided (*The Berlin [Potsdam Conference], July 17-August 2, 1945. (a) Protocol of the Proceedings, August 1, 1945; [https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/decade17.asp](https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/decade17.asp); 2020/11/15*), emerged as a bulwark between the two blocks. This had been manifest in many occurrences of the Cold War, the erection of The Berlin Wall (see *Herrmann, Peter, 2010: The “Berlin Wall”: Breaking Down Structures – Breaking Down Relationships; in: Besosa, Mayra et. altera (eds.): Walls, Fences, Borders, and Boundaries: Essays on Social Exclusion, Inclusion and Integration; Dubuque: KendallHunt: 197-217*) and not least – in a very subtle way – the delay of a establishing a constitution for the country – the argument had been that one would have to wait until a “unification”. Because there have been some special notion going with the fact that Germany had been in fact two German states two entirely different social political and social economic systems.

As such, it has been also of outstanding importance in the years after the change, although the meaning then had been inverted, the quoted phrase “What belongs together, is growing together again”<sup>14</sup> clearly implying the claim to sole representation from the west. In this light we can speak with some justification of a takeover – while other countries of the region maintained (some may want to say: regained) their independence, the GDR has been integrated in the former FRG, very much so under the aegis of the west and as well very much remaining in the position of the periphery of the rich western parts. And indeed, until today there is a major gap in the living standards between east and west Germany (see e.g. *Bartels, C., Schröder, C., October 2020: Die Bedeutung von Mieteinkommen und Immobilien für*

---

<sup>14</sup> [https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Willy\\_Brandt](https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Willy_Brandt), 2020/11/08/ with reference "In 1989, as quoted in "Confederation Again" (26 July 2018), by Brian Reynolds Myers, Sthele Press"; according to the German reference ([https://de.wikiquote.org/wiki/Willy\\_Brandt](https://de.wikiquote.org/wiki/Willy_Brandt)) this is according to the „Bundeskanzler Willy Brandt Stiftung“ a shorthand of the sentence „Jetzt sind wir in einer Situation, in der wieder zusammenwächst, was zusammengehört.“ (Now we are in a situation where what belongs together is growing together again. - transl PH)

*die Ungleichheit in Deutschland. Wirtschaftsdienst 100, 741–746 (2020); <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10273-020-2756-6>*. This is of special importance as the maintenance of such gap established a very specific notion, characterising cohesion and the lack of it within the German borders, expressed in the following aspects: (i) in objective and subjective terms a structure that is difficult to break open, characterised by the juxtaposition of “Wessies” and “Ossies”; (ii) the establishment of a nation state that (re)claimed the role of an imperial leader, referring to its “historic position”, its strong economic performance and its relative openness — ignoring e.g. the infamous role it played in history or the fact that the “relative openness” had been that of maintaining the segregation of citizens with migratory background and the economic performance not least depending on blossoming landscapes never meant to develop in its true meaning, on the contrary always depending on certain social groups or regions falling behind. Looking at the former GDR, supposing that this is part of the CEE as region, it implied the ambiguity: Suggesting that “Ossies”, classified as second-class citizens, are nevertheless part of Germany as global or at least European hegemon. In other words, we were witnessing the qualification of some nationals of a “first class state” as “second-class citizens”. While it is not the entire truth, it is an important part of the wider constellation behind the extremist right and fascist forces and their rise in the “eastern federal states”. (iii) The lack of mutual respect, for instance evidenced in the fact that there had not been any serious consideration to maintain those elements from the socio-political and socio-economic system of the GDR that had been advantageous. On the contrary, the new situation meant that there had not been any counterpower, forcing the old capitalism to concessions in the spirit of social security, social progress and social respect. “Return of Manchester Capitalism” had been an often-heard phrase. For many, the situation had been made more daunting by “the West “celebrating its generosity” by granting more or less meaningless, symbolic gestures: allowing the continued use of the *Ampelmaennchen* (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ampelmännchen>; 2020/11/15) and maintaining



a somewhat distinct rule for drivers turning to the right even if the traffic light is red.

Cum grano salis, similarly complex constellations can be drawn for all CEE countries. Looking from the perspective of social quality at these countries today, i.e. analysing their developmental perspective, has to take this into account as defining factor for all these countries. Any analysis has to relate also to some general questions of national identity and its different temporary dimensions as they had been outlined earlier with reference to Fernand Braudel. The importance of each is seen by today's re-emerging nationalism and regionalism, which is consequence of the link between possibilities to digest transformation and having been forced to adapt to processes and structures alien to the deep rooted and/or more recent patterns of societal reproduction.

Finally there is an additional layer that has to be considered when it comes to an analysis of this kind, taking the social quality approach as methodological reference: as much as such analyses is iterative, it is also multilayered, i.e. dealing with countries as nation states and the people, constituting this as institutional entity and also being constituted by it.

## **A Methodology-Matrix**

Looking at what had been presented so far and in a somewhat anecdotal manner unveils a major challenge: we have to grasp a very complex scenario of methodological requirements in a way that is still reasonably operational. Quantitative analysis is very soon reaching its limits in making realities understood (see *Herrmann, Peter, 2012: Economic Performance, Social Progress and Social Quality; in: International Journal of Social Quality 2(1), Summer 2012: 41–55 (doi:10.3167/IJSQ.2012.020104)*); in consequence we have to transform the multi-layered perspective<sup>15</sup> into a procedure of multiple consecutive steps — at the end we will still be limited to undertake one step only, importantly keeping the other aspects in mind.

---

<sup>15</sup> Applying computer simulation would allow a multi-layered conceptualisation of analysis, however this is not possible due to the non-quantifiable perspective.

## I.

Referring to the theory of regulation, we take the accumulation regime and the mode of regulation as point of departure for the analysis. With this we are looking at the foundation of society building as socio-politico-economic structuration. As such it is quasi-reified in a specific set of normative and legal mechanisms of regulation (see *Herrmann, Peter, 2014: Social Policy – Production rather than Distribution. A Rights-Based Approach; Bremen/Oxford: EHV Academic Press; 2014; 978-3-86741-744-0*).

## II.

While these are without question general-concrete formations, they are as such not yet specific. In this respect it is useful to look at two dimensions of concretisation, namely the life regime (in analogy to the accumulation regime) and the mode of living (analogous to the accumulation regime/mode of regulation). Taking the two aspects together (i. and II.), allows us to dive into understanding the interlink between structure and process as well as it allows to better understand the interplay between society and individual.

## III.

Subsequently, the interplay between life regime and mode of living, i.e. the 'general living conditions' and the specific 'translation into real life situations, lived by real people under real socio-personal conditions', can be grasped by the social quality approach with the three pillars of constitutional factors, conditional factors and normative factors.<sup>16</sup>

On the one hand this is used to refer back to the analysis of the two preceding layers, namely the foundation and the concretisation. At the same time it opens the prospective to analysing the historical dimension and the spatial dimension, as it will be presented in the following.

## IV.

---

<sup>16</sup>

A comprehensive overview can be found on the social quality associations website: International Association on Social Quality, April 2020: Elaboration of the Theory of Social Quality and Its Approach; <https://socialquality.org/theory/>; 2020-10-29

What had been presented earlier with reference to Fernand Braudel, is here understood as three dimensions of the historical perspective, namely stabilisation (long durée), modification (time of episodes) and the alteration or adaptation respectively (history of events).

V.

The spatial dimension is composed of the local level, the immediate community and reference to peers; the first level of regional development, the characteristics being positioned within nation-states; the level of the nation-state; the second level of regional development, characterised by the contradistinction to other regions; followed by the perspective of global society and finally by cosmo-political perspectives.

Of course, finally we have to consider the mutual influence and interference of the historical and the spatial dimension.

## **Socio-cultural analysis of hindering societal processes in the CEE-countries – a first approach**

The fundamental problem of the history of these countries has to be seen in the fact of a historical experiment, establishing a socio-economic system within the confines of first one country, later then a calculable group of countries. Problematic is the fact that any initiative geared towards the constitution of a socialist formation has to be by its very definition a global enterprise. This statement does not refer to the earlier debates on socialism in one country although they surely play some role too. It is suggested that we are dealing with the tension between the constitution of a formation on the one hand and the establishment or design of the system on the other hand.<sup>17</sup> The conceptual reference to formation (instead of system) aims at highlighting the conscious interwovenness of the macro- and the microlevel. While we have to keep all aspects of the methodology matrix in mind, we

---

<sup>17</sup> See for an earlier thorough discussion on the concept of information for instance Inst. für Marxist. Studien u. Forschungen (IMSF) [ed.] 1981: *Ökonomische Gesellschaftsformationen: Theorie u. Geschichte*; Frankfurt/Main: IMSF; in a legal perspective Pashukanis, Evgeny Bronislavovich, 1924: *The General Theory of Law and Marxism in: Selected Writings on Marxism and Law*; edited and with an Introduction by Piers Beirne/Robert Sharlet; Translated by Peter B. Maggs; Foreword by John N. Hazard; London et. Later: Academic Press, 1980

focus for the purpose of a concrete analysis on the social quality approach, i.e. the third and middle layer of the matrix. The reasoning behind this is given by the fact that we can understand from here the entirety, centred around the historical materialist approach, contending that “the determining factor in history is, in the last resort, the production and reproduction of the immediate life” (*Engels, Frederick, 1884: Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State. Preface [to the First Edition]; in: Karl Marx Frederick Engels. Collected Works. Volume 26. Frederick Engels. 1882-89; London: Lawrence&Wishart, 1990: 131-133; here: 131*). In practice the politics of this micro-macro-interplay turned obviously in many cases into highly problematic constellations as it is difficult or even impossible to draw a clear demarcation line between mutual understanding and help on the one hand, on the other hand permanent control and tutelage. By and large, this can be seen as political contest and control<sup>18</sup> while at the same time the degree of social integration and cohesion has to be acknowledged, even allowing a relatively high degree of empowerment, given by the fact of a well-developed schooling system, the support of a wide variety of children’s activities and not least a wide range of public services in various respects, reaching for instance from accessing public transport to allowing the participation in cultural events, being understood also as instrument of empowerment. The problem is that we are dealing with the interpenetration of social fabric but completely different standards as they did exist hitherto.

Here we return to an earlier debate in the development of social quality thinking, namely the understanding of the dimension of quality. Is quality a matter of positive qualification of certain circumstances, i.e. are we talking about quality in the meaning of a positive qualification? Or is quality simply a matter of measurement, assessment of a matter, process, structure or relationship? Looking against this background at the transformation, we can easily see that the actual meaning of standards changed. In other words, we can apply the various indicators as they are suggested by the social quality

---

<sup>18</sup> While this refers here first and foremost to the internal contests it has to be kept in mind that all this had been also strongly shaped by the fact of the global setting, i.e. the fact that the entire national setting had been strongly shaped by the fact of being part of a contest between two formations.

approach at the ante- and post transformation stage, their meaning changed fundamentally. This is true in two respects. (i) While all SQ-factors are also relevant in the pre-transformation era, their meaning had been rather different. For instance, socio-economic security played obviously always a role. However, the means of achievement had been very different. (ii) This leads to the second perspective: the means of securitisation being different, implies a different understanding. — One example<sup>19</sup> is the more extended means and acceptance of public transport; while this had been in some respect a matter of lacking alternatives, another point had been of major importance: the acceptance of “collective solutions” and the different weighing of domains of life. Little can be found in the standard textbooks; information could and can be drawn from films, novels (*Willi Bredel: Ein Neues Kapitel; Erik Neutsch: Trace of Stones; Dieter Noll: The Adventures of Werner Holt*), music and sometimes biographies and they are increasingly becoming available for instance in films like *Gundermann (Dresen, Andreas [Regie]/Laila Stieler [Drehbuch], 2020: Gundermann)* or the exhibitions of photographs as those by Harald Hauswald. Not least, more and more talk shows are allowing to gain some insight (e.g. *SUPERillu Verlag, 2019/03/20; Zwei Legenden: Gregor Gysi trifft Joachim Streich bei SUPERillu-Stadtgespräch in Magdeburg; <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Z7GOLz1tzo>; 2020/10/29; #MissverstehenSieMichRichtig #MSMR #Gesprächsreihe, 2018/12/22: Gregor Gysi & Carmen-Maja Antoni; Teil 1: <https://youtu.be/0beBfKDJCnA>, Teil 2: [https://youtu.be/jSyAWYM\\_REE](https://youtu.be/jSyAWYM_REE); 2020/10/30).*

As much as such analysis — or should we say: surveying of complex realities?<sup>20</sup> — conveys a picture of real life, it allows as well a deeper understanding of the actual meaning of labour, consumption, regulation and law.

---

<sup>19</sup> and saying one example, means to stay alert - referring to examples also entails fading out some aspects although they are factually relevant

<sup>20</sup> it requires much attention and interpretative mindfulness to understand such material in a way that allows the extraction of the relevant information regarding life regime and mode of living.

## Conclusion

The foregoing methodological reflections can only be seen as a sketch of an approach, suitable to develop an understanding of the social quality of countries and regions that are undergoing a process of transformation — and it is strongly based on a review of the developments in the former GDR.

(i) Transformation means, importantly, that we are not looking at the development of key factors — a development that is concerned with different paths and movements on one common ground. Instead, we are concerned with paths and movements on different planes. (ii) This means not least that we need a different terminology although and especially if we apply the same words and concepts — this may be the case when it comes to socio-economic security but also when we talk about justice, emancipation, the number and role of solicitors or medical doctors or the role of the family ... . (iii) Applying a thorough, “deep” analysis allows to relate different aspects of social quality (analysis), ventilating questions like the following: Are we concerned with secular developments or are they specific to individual countries, regions and/or specific periods? Are they specifically defined by historical circumstances, and if so: is it a matter of stability, alteration or far-reaching change? Can they be considered as genuine developments, based in inherent contradictions, emerging from tensions and contradictions in the geopolitical settings or result of some kind of octroi?

The main issue for developing a social quality perspective in respect of transformation can be defined by the extent and degree of non-/conformity and coherence/divergence between the point of departure and the new/future societal pattern. (iv) This adds a new dimension to social quality analysis which may be called “degree of disruption”. While there is the popular saying that the grass is always greener on the other side, there is also the widely accepted wisdom that nowhere is better than home and it is difficult to transplant old trees. This is what we find as part of processes of transformation: the alternative that had been promised — the blossoming landscapes — turned out to be much less than the promised land and

brought in fact in several instances — for certain groups of the population and/or in respect of certain issues (as child care, provision of healthcare, accessibility of cultural spaces ...) disadvantages “without compensation”. Taking all this together, we can say metaphorically that transformation forced people in several cases to speak a language which they did not fully understand, full of “false kindred”.