

## THE ROLE OF ENDOGENOUS AND EXOGENOUS FACTORS IN UKRAINIAN MODERNIZATION

*UDC 323:316.733](477)*

**А. А. Лаврињенко**

Donetsk National University, Ukraine

**Abstract.** *In this article, the author examines the problems of Ukrainian modernization policy, in the context of which the author has analyzed the correlation of endogenous and exogenous factors, with specific reference to the socio-cultural component in the modernization process. The problem of rebirth of national cultural traditions has been foregrounded, with particular emphasis on the retraditionalization of state political system playing the key role in the process of further reformation of all spheres of public life. On the basis of retrospective analysis, the author discusses the advantages and disadvantages of the Ukrainian modernization process.*

**Key words:** *modernization, endogenous and exogenous factors, retraditionalization, the national interest.*

### INTRODUCTION

The notion of “modernization” is one of the trendy characteristics of the Ukrainian present-day government. As the unambiguous solution to the problem of an optimal correlation of inner and outer factors influencing the modernization processes in Ukraine has not been offered yet, it appears to be rather vital and topical regarding the present conditions. Moreover, the developed countries experience ascertains the necessity for a balanced development of political institutions and socio-cultural sphere of Ukrainian social life to create an effective strategy for the development of state foreign policy.

It is the post-Soviet space scientists who mostly contribute to the research of Ukrainian modernization problems (Y. Golovakha, T. Zaslavskaya, O. Kutsenko, Y. Bokarev, A. Glinchikova and others). Some of them criticize the CIS (Commonwealth of Independent States) modernization processes, relying on their foreign colleagues competence (E. Shils, S. Eisenstadt, S. Huntington), while others endeavour to find the most appropriate solution for the given situation in terms of modernization. However, all of them emphasize the socio-

---

Submitted December 30<sup>st</sup>, 2013

**Corresponding author:** G. A. Lavrynenko

Donetsk National University, 83037, Karl Marks St., 1/40, Donetsk, Ukraine

E-mail: lavryk@mail.ru

cultural component in the given process as a basis for any reforms in the state. Thus, the aim of the article is to ascertain the degree of balance between endogenous and exogenous factors of Ukrainian modernization process.

Distinguished in the theory of modernization are the following two directions: liberal and conservative. The representatives of the liberal vector consider the process of modernization to be a transition from the traditional society to the contemporary one (domestic scientists often describe the given process as “westernization”). The conservative school emphasizes the inner contradictions in the modernization process, the need for conformity in the nature and direction of the development processes, the historical and national characteristics of the developing countries, as well as the CIS countries.

Only by 1990s had certain evolution in the interpretation of the modernization process been achieved. Having started in Europe and subsequently spreading to other countries in the same manner, it was initially designated as Europeanization or “westernization”. But the experience of classical modernization theory in the postcolonial countries posed the question of its appropriateness and provoked criticism of it being one-way and western-centric. In particular, M. Levi estimated the “catching-up” development critically and suggested the dependence from the West to be the key factor in preserving the backwardness. S. Eisenstadt raised the question on the uniqueness of the national socio-cultural traditions, highlighted the importance of their preservation and, as a result, “the significant institutional variety of up-to-date and modernizing societies”. S. Huntington in his turn considered it impossible to implement western experience in the traditional societies [8].

The reconsideration of previous conceptions served as the basis for the creation of multifactorial and polyvariant modernization theories. In the new interpretation, it appeared as multiple and invertible. In the view of the foregoing, it would be reasonable to examine in depth different variations of modernization theory, applied to the territory of the former USSR, including Ukraine.

Thus, E. Pain compared the neo-modernism theory of the 1980-90s to a classic version of modernization theory. The greatest value for the problem at issue have those neo-modernism features which, despite the classic modernization conceptions, underline its endogenous, immanent factors, focus on the role of exogenous factors, geopolitical and economic conditions of world states development [6].

Relying on the above said, A. Panarin proposed the conception of two types of mentalities: the European and the Eurasian. The given conception focused on the fundamental difference in consciousness and development peculiarities, which never overlap, just like parallel worlds. The European mentality was presented as evolutionary, temporal, success and future-oriented, which thus corresponded to forward-thinking. At the same time, the Eurasian mentality was viewed as horizontal and spatial, including deliberateness and tending to Eurasian nations paternalism [7]. Besides, in one way or another, the given conception may be characterized by cultural traditions idealization and it may slightly contradict the modern world development tendencies.

In addition, A. Panarin emphasized that the former USSR countries (including Ukraine) were (if not the only) to equate the modernization to “westernization”, identifying it as “the unique and impeccable” pattern. However, the variations of modernization theory including the synthesis of various approaches (including the mixed ones which have given better results, as the experience of the Pacific countries shows) have not been taken into account [11].

Distinguished in the political science are the following three types of modernization:

- *Exogenous type* is exercised on the basis of borrowing, given the lack of an internal simulation, imitation-simulation and imitation variants; (it is common in former colonies);
- *Endogenous type* is exercised on the home basis by developed countries (USA, Europe);
- *Endogenous-exogenous type* is put into effect both on the home basis and on the basis of borrowing; (it is common in a number of states neighbouring the Western countries) [10].

Taking into consideration that political modernization is a transition from one type of political system to another, it is generally aimed at: the democratization of the society, extending the scope of human liberties and participation in public affairs management, increasing the public authorities' social responsibility, multiplication of options and release from the pressure of traditions. The choice of modernization type begins in the political sphere, by the demonstration of political will to change. Performed subsequently, a political modernization provides for further modernization of other public life spheres [4].

The failure of Ukrainian modernization reforms has given rise to a strong criticism of the modernization theory. Researchers have described it from different perspectives, pointing out to specific drawbacks of a particular direction for its implementation and underlining the possible prospects for further development of the state in case of opting for a particular model.

After the collapse of the USSR, scientists embarked on numerous debates on the choice of the most effective modernization model. The political elites of emerging independent countries faced the problem of choosing a vector for further development. There was a choice between introducing either a westernized variant of modernization (power decentralization, modification of the state governance system, transition from a centralized/planned economy to a market economy) or, as an alternative, the possibility of introducing the Chinese modernization model (but without introducing political democratization and free-market relations). But, given that China was considered to be politically and economically lagging behind the USSR, the Chinese model was not taken into consideration. The western modernization model, which was taken as the basis, was supported and successfully introduced by implementing radical reforms. Nevertheless, the myth of possible successful state development based on the Chinese model is also topical today.

In the first half of the 1990s, a number of experts proposed a paradigm of "catching-up modernization". They indicated the bleak prospects of the endogenous factor and pointed out to the necessity to involve external elements or conditions of modernization. It was also suggested that the one of the main characteristics of the modernization in Ukraine (as well as in others former USSR countries) was the exogenous factor – the outer impulse of its development, associated with the use of foreign experience [1]. Ukraine was referred to a secondary model of modernization, based on catching-up development and economic reforms conservatism, mainly focused on formal changes.

However, modernization processes in Ukraine were also defined as "westernization", which was perceived as a complete adoption of western political and economic development models. Concurrently, in the mid-1990s, along with criticism, there were some constructive proposals on the necessity to overcome the technocratic complexes and the need to share the

cultural and spiritual fundamentals of modern civilization, primarily associated with internal values rather than the external factors.

It should be noted that, from the modernization prospective, the features of the Ukrainian society and public consciousness that might have promoted the renovation remained out of researchers' sight. Besides, the negative factors came into focus which blocked up modernization processes in the country: the lack of strong western-style "rational thinking" tradition, unlimited autocracy, extensive development, communal communism, thirst for egalitarianism, Orthodoxy as an intensive form of public consciousness [9].

In the early 2000s, the criticism on modernization reforms in Ukraine was amplified by emphasizing the additional drawbacks: the conflict between the traditional and the contemporary; insufficient interest of the state for the lower social strata as the most likely victims of the modernization process; the strong correlation between the endogenous and exogenous factors which is necessarily bound to change in the process of transition from the traditional to a contemporary society. Today, there are opposing points of view on this issue. Some experts state that modernization theory (as a basis for all reforms) just a theoretical construction rather than an ideological construction. That is why traditional and contemporary societies are treated therein as ideal types. Such contradictions are quite common in every society. In most cases, they are the first "stumbling bloc" on the way to reforming the political, economic and social state systems. Consequently, it is not the scientific theory that has to decide on modernisation but the political elite of a state which is to determine the price to be paid and to assume political and ethical responsibility for those who might suffer during this process [2].

Furthermore, along with the institutional component of modernization, the mid-2000s featured topical debates on the socio-cultural conditions underlying these changes. Divergences in political and economic modernization experiences on both national and subnational level were explained by cultural differences. The supporters of socio-cultural theories on the originality of Orthodox civilisations consider that the building of statehood and the entire public life is possible only by strengthening the role of endogenous modernization factor on a traditional spiritual and cultural basis. Yet, due to their strong anti-Western attitude, these theories are usually referred to as anti-modernization ones.

The geostrategic choice is also one of the main problems of the Ukrainian modernization process. In the current social circumstances, considering the diversity of modernization models (Westernism, anti-Westernism, Eurasianism and integration model), the latest option seems to be largely preferred in Ukraine because it presupposes the strategy of involvement in the globalized world. In this context, it is assumed that Ukraine, shall become neither a Western nor anti-Western state; in an attempt to avoid self-isolation, it will focus on the goals of national revival.

Yet, the modernization processes in Ukraine are frequently described in terms of "a post-Western transit way", which implies the necessary to generate such a course of transformation relations in the society which would observe the specific national-state characteristics and provide for the appropriate entrance into the post-Western civilization development corridor. It is also necessary to create the so-called blend of Eastern and Western values in response to global challenges [5].

Recently, the national science has raised an issue concerning the rejection of national cultural values which may hinder the modernization processes [9]. This attitude indicates that the Ukrainian culture contains a lot of principles which are contradictory to the basic

values of social relations connected with modernization. In contrast, there is an alternative opinion [6] on a pseudo-dilemma of national culture and modernization confrontation. It has been affirmed that under favourable circumstances the formation of modernity values leads to the formation of modern social and political relations (and not vice-versa), considering that modernity values are endogenous values of individualized society (free choice, individualism, authenticity) which are impossible to adopt or to enforce from outside [3]. Thus, as proclaimed in the times of the Soviet Union, the modernization course by definition excluded any conformist relations. But it was a formal message, which was reflected in the development and expansion of traditional institutes in collective community. After obtaining independence, Ukraine tried to modernize the political and economic spheres without taking into account the socio-cultural element. As a result, previous experiences of modernization processes in Ukraine were rather inefficient due to the formal attitude to reforms and inconsistent argumentation.

Lately, considering the numerous failed modernization attempts, the question of revival of national traditions and the retraditionalization of political systems has been increasingly (and justifiably) raised in the political circles of the post-Soviet countries. Over the past years, Ukraine made the first steps in this direction: recoil in the institutional sphere (cancellation of the Constitutional reform of 2004); strengthening the presidential power accompanied by slackening the power of the legislative body; revival of the dominant position of the ruling majority accompanied by slackening the impact of the opposition forces; gradual rebirth of collective consciousness; reconstruction of the spiritual and cultural component of society.

Concurrently, Ukraine has not entirely abandoned the process of modernization, which is evident in the widely supported and legally approved Euro-integration state foreign policy development course. Being essential for state economy, this course has not been repudiated by any political and expert group.

Finally, it should be underlined that the variety of Ukrainian modernization forms shows a lack of relevant, well-balanced and optimal alternative for solving the correlation problem between the endogenous and exogenous factors. In terms of the state strategy choice, the socio-cultural traditions have the dominant position in the society. This fact shall not be ignored because it may lead to negative consequences and result in creating a different social reality and hybrid forms of state government. Moreover, it may have a destructive effect on the operation and further development of the state. It should also be noted that the problem of rebirth of national cultural traditions has been placed in the foreground, with particular emphasis on the retraditionalization of the state political system which plays the essential role in the process of further reformation of all spheres of public life.

#### REFERENCES

1. Alekseev, V., *Opyt rossiiskikh modernizatsii XVIII—XX vv.*, Moscow: Science, 2010.
2. Fedotova, V., *Neklassicheskie modernizatsii i al'ternativy modernizatsionnoi teorii*, *Voprosy filosofii*, 12/2012, pp.3–21.
3. Glinchikova, A., *Demokraticeskaya modernizatsiya i natsional'naya kul'tura*, *Polis*, 6/2010, pp.54–67.
4. Lijphart, A., *Patterns of Democracy*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
5. Nisnevich, Yu., *Problemy tranzita v usloviyakh postindustrial'nogo razvitiya*, *Vestnik MGU, Politicheskie nauki*, 12(3)/2009, pp.94–104.

6. Pain, E., *Mnogokul'turnaya modernizatsiya: evolyutsiya teoreticheskikh vzglyadov*, *Istoricheskie nauki i sovremennost'*, 6/2009, pp.37–54.
7. Panarin, A., *Pravoslavnyaya tsivilizatsiya v global'nom mire*, Moscow: Science, 2013.
8. Poberezhnikov, I., *Perekhod ot traditsionnogo k industrial'nomu obshchestvu: teoretiko-metodologicheskie problemy modernizatsii*, Moscow: Science, 2011.
9. Polyakov, L., *Metodologiya issledovaniya rossiiskoi modernizatsii*, *Polis*, 3/2011, pp.5–15.
10. Shugart, M. & Carey, J., *Presidents and Assemblies: Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
11. Weber, M., *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

## **ULOGA ENDOGENIH I EGZOGENIH ČINILACA U UKRAJINSKIM MODERNIZACIONIM PROCESIMA**

*Autorka razmatra probleme ukrajinske politike modernizacije i u tom kontekstu analizira međusobni odnos egzogenih i endogenih činilaca. Naročita pažnja posvećena je sociokulturnoj komponenti datog procesa. Aktualizuje se problem preporoda kulturnih tradicija nacije, gde se retraditionalizacija političkog sistema države pojavljuje kao fundamentalni činilac daljeg preoblikovanja svih sfera društvenog života. Na osnovu retrospektivne analize određene su pozitivne i negativne strane ukrajinske modernizacije.*

*Ključne reči: modernizacija, endogeni i egzogeni činilaci, retraditionalizacija, nacionalni interes.*